

The Bisected A.B.

By RICHARD M. GUMMERE

Director of Admissions, Harvard College, Harvard University

The proposed operation on a degree which has done yeoman service since the thirteenth century has already provoked much discussion. Its history, and the changes which have developed during its long existence, have been thoroughly overhauled. The contents and character of the four-year liberal arts college course have been challenged, not only in connection with the present suggestion that it be reduced in extent, but on the ground that American conditions are altered and that an earlier start in graduate or professional study should be available. The application of the German Ph.D. program to the third undergraduate year, the function of the junior college, and the attitude of the public that education should be more closely allied to life-experience, brought the debate into sharper relief. And the decision of the University of Chicago, to grant this Bachelor's degree at the close of a two-year observation and survey of the main fields of learning, makes the affirmative and the negative sides stand out unequivocally.

There is, accordingly, no need to invoke the shades of our colonial colleges, the best of which admitted men to an *ad eundem* at Oxford or Cambridge, in preparation for the church or the bar or the forum; there is no news value in comments upon the European school system, adequate (before the war) for placing pupils beyond our college freshman status. The vital issue is not acceleration,—a reasonable procedure under certain circumstances, as in the present crisis. For purposes of winning the war, the speeding up of technical and scientific skills and a general "all-out" attitude, are justifiable policies. But when democratic freedom prevails again and the dictators are laid in the dust, it is questionable whether education should rush along at such a rate of speed, or whether an enriched is not better than a curtailed curriculum. The danger lies in *abbreviation*. And the immediate question is, whether we shall follow President Hutchins in this amputation of the traditional undergraduate degree.

Since we have before us a characteristically American situation, streamlined and carried over from the mass-production procedure of business, neither the hallowed past nor the critical future should interfere with an impartial common-sense view. We must supply the needs of a coming period when costs will be a vital criterion, when the business of the country will be confronted with new issues, and when the cultural content will be sifted

over for the benefit of another generation. It is perfectly clear that in the present emergency we need strong, quick-acting, and rapidly trained men. But after the threat of death to all the valued traditions of our Western and American civilization shall have been removed, the good life in a post-war world must be resumed. This good life means leisure, beauty, tolerance, individual development, as well as despatch and technical skills. The education which is to produce such results must be inclusive of both the ideal or traditional elements of our past and an incisive mastery of technique. No slide-rule will settle it. The typical fraternity loafer will be a rudimentary survival; but the need for cumulative contacts and exchange of ideas in a college community will still remain. The sharp contrast between work and leisure will give way to a philosophy where work is a pleasure and leisure an opportunity. Cultural and vocational studies must both play their parts. The concentrative and the distributive courses must be represented. Mr. Lynn White, Jr., in the *Journal of the History of Ideas* for April, 1942, has most truly remarked: "In our western culture every activity maintains its vitality not by the solution of its problems but by preserving bi-polarity between irreconcilables, and by living in the resultant magnetic field." (P. 152.)

The social and political program of the future as certain of our leading statesmen have indicated for the United States, and as the British Labor and Conservative parties have proclaimed, with the blessing of their churches, will call for many simplifications. The Atlantic Charter will mean plainer living, religious and social cooperation, mass production in the machinery of existence, greater leisure for personal satisfactions, and a guidance-controlled assembly-line from the first elementary grade for all through university specialization for those who deserve it. This New Deal will be a New World, whether we like it or not. No Arnold-Huxley debate on Culture versus Science will be in order. In such an atmosphere the purely-scholar type advocated by Mr. Hutchins could not live by books alone. Nor could the sharp-eyed scientist, who is brilliantly helping to win the war for freedom, live in a post-war period of hustle and shop and laboratory and rapid stream-lining. There cannot be the complete disengagement of an Athenian discussion-group, nor yet the feverish mechanical pace of an industrialized world rushing rapidly Heaven knows whither.

The statement by representatives of the junior colleges—that they prefer to function as terminal post-graduate additions to the high-school course, and as occasional spring-boards to advanced standing in four-year colleges, rather than invading baccalaureate territory for purposes of a diploma—comfortably narrows the field of discussion. We may thus ask three questions: first, whether it is the function of the American high school to arrange its last two years in such a way that more adult subject-matter be included. Secondly, we wonder whether, if the answer to the first question is negative, enough material worthy of an A. B. degree could be acquired by the end of

the sophomore year. And thirdly, those who believe that graduate or professional work, involving highly specialized training and demanding fundamental tools for its proper application, will need to be convinced that an abbreviated preliminary training will suffice.

The writer of this article desires to record himself as in favor of three "theses": that the high school should not be "stream-lined" any further, that the four-year liberal arts college, with its last two years often overlapping into the preliminaries of graduate study, should be left in its present framework, and that specialized study should begin only when the student is ready to assimilate it. The high school, with its 250 different courses or combinations of courses, should not subject the adolescent learner to a premature adulthood. The four-year college (which for many decades has permitted graduation in a shorter time) can continue to offer a cultural and vocational mixture; for it is the heir of the seventeenth-century British university, modified by the technical and modern elements gradually adopted as the Industrial Revolution progressed. And we are surprised that the protagonist of the two-year A.B., an ardent advocate of the great cultural tradition, would rush a student through the general fields of learning at such express-train speed.

Let us consider the first "thesis,"—the American secondary school. From a set curriculum in the eighteenth century, containing not more than three subjects of major dimensions, we have reached a stage of high vocational variation, progressive methods, and an astonishing degree of "life-experience" study, where almost every occupation or trade is foreshadowed in the program, open to choice under vocational guidance in the earliest 'teens. The content of learning common to all pupils is vastly diminished, from the days when the tasks were continuous and almost uniform. It is this variety, curiously enough, which has prompted the survey or observation course in the early years of college; because the pupils had less cultural ground on which to meet than was the case fifty years ago. It is also responsible for the progressive groupings of related subjects, in an endeavor to establish such a common ground at an earlier age. The complexity of modern life has led the public to believe that an early foretaste of some specialty is essential to success in that specialty in later years. And some of this is wise; for if a pupil is indulged in such a preliminary to the extent of one quarter of his time, with interest aglow and consequent application, the general material with which an intelligent college man or woman should be familiar will be accepted, even against the grain, as a vital necessity. But the school should not be dragooned into more adult fields unless the pupil is markedly ready; a good example of error in this regard is the passionate study of the combustion-engine on the part of some mechanically inclined boy, without the cumulative drill of well-taught mathematics, and with the consequent tragedy of exclusion from any engineering school. The Army and Navy,

reacting to the needs of the present crisis, are rectifying this situation on a common-sense basis. They have called the attention of educational groups to the poverty of our high-school offerings in mathematics. They have pointed out that in a certain selective examination a majority of candidates failed to pass the arithmetical reasoning section, that only ten per cent of the candidates had been exposed to elementary trigonometry, and that less than one-quarter of the group had taken more than one and a half years of mathematics in high school. The school, therefore, should contract rather than expand its offerings! We have made the mistake of "taking all knowledge to be our province," as if the bridge-building expert could burst into flower at the age of fourteen, or as if the linguist could dazzle his freshman French instructor after a course in "general language" in the ninth grade. We believe that a scientist cannot profit by a four-year, or a two-year, liberal arts or engineering course without his mathematics through trigonometry, and that the student of literature will be a bungler without a three- or four-year sequence of a foreign language.

Consequently, while a few schools will continue to prepare pupils for a diploma which is equivalent to completion of a freshman year, and while others will send to college boys and girls who need elementary grounding before they are capable of higher education, it is fair to say that the secondary school should not be burdened with any responsibility for abbreviating the period introductory to specialized or graduate study. There is a distinct danger in the loss of fundamentals; and if the reduced time or the heavier burden in the adolescent stage means a more superficial acquaintance with the essentials of mathematics or science or a foreign language or history, or involves a garbled preparation in English reading and writing skill, the situation becomes serious. We are entirely in harmony with a pupil's completing his school, or his college or his university, two years earlier than his next-door neighbor; but we deprecate any omission of the prerequisites to mastery. The details of promotion will follow logically if the process is democratically selective, thorough in subject-matter knowledge, and definite in the purposes outlined. And if one looks forward with prophetic vision to the Brave New World when many more hobby-subjects will form an individualized fringe in the curriculum, there is all the more reason to advocate a deliberate and well-rounded period preliminary to college entrance or to business apprenticeship.

If, then, it is correct to assume that the school should be spared the burden of additional adult training; if the junior college feels emphatically that its duty lies in the previously mentioned terminal offerings, the liberal arts college must carry the load. And why not? We confess ourselves in sympathy with President Cowley's Conclusion.¹ The Middle Ground is vitally important. We see no reason for avoiding the blend of near-university or

¹ *The Atlantic Monthly*, June, 1942.

university work which occupies the climax of the undergraduate stage,—mixed in such a way that the upperclassman could sample many fields if he chose, or employ his time in reducing the amount of research required for an advanced degree,—in medicine, or law, or business administration, or any other final educational accolade.

In the program of a young man or woman who will be completing an education in the year 1950, the college period will be a cumulative process rather than an interval marked off from school on the one side and professional training on the other. It will be *terminal* for many, and in many cases it will come in itself to a professional climax. Others will still explore as much as possible throughout the four years. Those who are qualified may acquire the Bachelor's degree on an accelerated (but not an abbreviated) basis if they so desire. The teacher, lawyer, physician, research scientist, or government expert may focus on his concentration field in the junior or even sophomore year; but the process should be elastic and voluntary.

The survey course, however, which is recommended as a companion-process to the truncated A.B., is an inadequate pattern of education. It is bound to be superficial, even in the hands of a great lecturer. It puts out of court the possibility of learning a new foreign language thoroughly, or of mastering the continuous and concrete details of mathematics. It skips genially through literary masterpieces as the sight-seer in former days used to "do" a European art gallery. It offers glittering generalities in science without the habit of painstaking investigation needed for introductory courses in physics, or chemistry, or biology. One can understand why a long distance reading course in any fundamental subject is useful for extension purposes or for the business man who can find only an hour or so per day to improve his cultural stock. The observation or survey method of learning belongs with the adult who wishes to fill in the gaps of his previous education, or to advance in a field auxiliary to his hobby. There is no useless form of education if it is earnestly pursued, whether by individuals or by classes. But since the problem at issue refers either to the complete training of a genuinely educated person, or the permit to enter a particular field of research, one thinks immediately of most occupations as suffering if they are entered upon by persons not equipped with certain fundamental tools—linguistic, scientific, historical, logical—each involving at least a preliminary expertness. And this the survey courses, especially if they form eighty per cent of the students' work for the two years following a school diploma, will not accomplish.

The liberal arts college must take the responsibility both for the research specialist and for the person who will stop short of that point but will possess an understanding of the spiritual, social, and economic forces in the world. It must equip with a basic culture both the technician and the man of gen-

eral interests. It must turn out men and women who are acquainted with many fields and yet have dug deep in at least one. It must not surrender to the immediate demands of vocational preparation, and yet it must acquaint the student with the types of things and persons likely to swim into his ken. It must teach the student that science alone is no panacea, and culture alone is no talisman. One questions whether two years of survey or observation courses can prepare a person for either specialization or general living. They are too wide for the former, offering no skilled tools for future use; they are so general that a five-foot shelf would be equally valuable, provided the young business man guaranteed himself three evenings of home reading or three nights per week in an extension class.

We wonder whether the A.B., bisected to two years, even with the stuffed-out high school equipment which we deprecate, could be defined as adequate preparation for research work. It is interesting but not relevant to introduce a comparison with the pre-war German university system, and to define it as an undemocratic affair. Our graduate schools are of course modelled on the German idea, for many reasons; but the parallel holds only in the graduate years *per se* and not in the undergraduate course. The reduced fees of our state universities and the scholarships offered by private foundations are in line with the selective doctrine promulgated by Jefferson; and many critics have felt that American educators erred in turning too many students loose in the research fields, encouraged beyond their capacity. There is a sharp contrast between the German youth who took up a trade on finishing the *Volksschule* and the American who, whatever his financial status, finds a career open to his talents, with a professional degree as a reward for work of distinction. In fact, if the A.B. degree were to be abbreviated, the non-professional student would be more sharply differentiated from the specialist than is now the case under the compromise system of a mixed four years of general plus specific training. The red herring trail of undemocratic danger may be erased from the debate-records. The countless surveys undertaken throughout the United States indicate that secondary and college educators are reaching out increasingly to welcome all types of adolescent; and there is no basis for arguing that the cumulative selection of the best students is an undemocratic procedure.

While the time intervals of acquiring degrees are variable according to the individual, it is quite another thing to shorten the amount or depth of the work to be done. With only two years, especially of predominately survey courses, there is not time for the preliminaries to graduate work. One will need, for all scientific, engineering, and statistical purposes, a profound knowledge of mathematics, a reading ability in one and preferably two foreign languages, and sufficient acquaintance with history, literature, government, and economics to understand and promote the welfare of the post-war world. One will need also a sense of not being hurried—so that

one's contacts and associations, so increasingly important with the rapidity and closeness of the world itself—so that these contacts and comparing of notes may go on with the proper assimilation and “seepage.” Incisive diagnosis, a sense of analytical values, does not come after rapid flights through vast fields of knowledge. For the diplomat or the civil servant, or the editor and political expert, the historical and linguistic material of several foreign countries (the Far East increasingly) must be at his fingers' ends. Our isolationist policies, fatal to world understanding, have made the American task difficult. One might run on through various other professions; but the thought constantly recurs to the minds of those who regard America as the “physician of the Iron Age,” as follows: our national craze for streamlining, for quickly acquired techniques, for mass production, for large-scale labor-saving devices in all forms of enterprise, for rapid economic results—is excellent for purposes of winning the war, but is not rich or deep enough for the long-distance policies of post-war living. This theme has been correctly emphasized, from Thomas Jefferson to Henry Adams to Walter Lippmann. And it ties in accurately with the education of the future leader.

It is for all these reasons that the writer of this article would amplify and enrich educational offerings rather than abbreviate them. A critic of American music, speculating on the lack of great creative works by our native composers, has referred the difficulty to the “mediocrity of the human stuff that betrays itself when the attention is transferred from artifice and technique to the *core* that they surround.” And if the students of the next two decades are to be supplied with satisfactory ideas and procedures, they must be given no quick-lunch food. It is only the permanent fundamentals which can be the basis for fresh symbols.

The College at the University of Chicago

C. H. FAUST

Dean of the College, the University of Chicago

The College at the University of Chicago differs in its entrance provisions, its plan of courses, and its graduation requirements from the traditional American college. Instead of demanding a high-school diploma, it admits students who have finished two years of high-school work. Instead of offering a collection of specialized courses, among which a student may take his choice, it provides a system of general courses designed to constitute a liberal education. It measures the student's progress in acquiring a liberal education by means of college-wide examinations; and it awards the Bachelor's degree for satisfactory performance on these examinations, rather than for the accumulation of credit for four years of miscellaneous class work. Since students who enter the College after two years of high-school work ordinarily require three or four years of directed study for their examinations, and those who enter the College after finishing high school usually need two years of training, the College expects to award the Bachelor's degree to most students by the end of what is traditionally the sophomore college year.

The Chicago plan of college education is not an historical accident, nor is it the result of a desire simply to be different. From its beginning the University has been concerned with the problem of general as over against specialized education. Its first president proposed that the first two years of college should be devoted to general education and that the completion of the work of these years should be marked by the awarding of a suitable diploma. In 1931, the University adopted a two-year program of college instruction consisting largely of courses which included several departmental fields. Four such general courses, each extending through an academic year, were then set up, paralleling the subject-matter arrangement of the upper divisions of the University: a general course in the physical sciences, one in the biological sciences, one in social studies, and one in the humanities. The satisfactory completion of this program of study, together with work in two narrower fields and in English composition, was measured solely by comprehensive examinations, and was recognized by the award of a certificate. At the suggestion of President Hutchins the University was at this time re-organized so as to provide separate administration, under the title of the College, for the work of the freshman and sophomore years. A little later, the last two years of the University High School were incorporated into the College; and since 1937 students who have completed two years of high-school work have been admitted to the College to begin a four-year course of study designed to provide a general education. Finally, in January of

this year, the University Senate approved the proposal of President Hutchins that the College be empowered to award the Bachelor's degree for the completion of general education, as redefined by the College Faculty.

These changes in the College at Chicago have been the results of the efforts of the University to perform the task which a college ought to perform in the American educational system. The College stands between two other parts of that system. Its work lies between the elementary training provided by the schools from which its students come and the specialized training furnished by the upper divisions and professional schools into which many of its students go.

It is the chief function of the elementary and secondary schools to lay the general foundations of education; that is to say, it is still the major task of these schools to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic so as to prepare their students, on the one hand, to profit from the knowledge and wisdom which would otherwise lie buried in books, and to prepare them, on the other hand, to participate profitably in the discussion of the urgent and difficult problems they will face as men and as citizens of a democracy. Elementary and secondary schools have, in addition, the task of providing fundamental instruction in geography, history, and the political institutions of the country.

The task of the professional schools and of the upper divisions of a university is to train specialists, a task of increasing importance and difficulty in our increasingly complex civilization, and one which in the present crisis is clearly essential to its defense.

Standing between these two parts of the American education system, between the schools whose business it is to provide the basic training in reading, writing, and arithmetic necessary for acquiring a liberal education, as well as for success in those departments of the university devoted to training specialists, the college has its own special function. It is a function of peculiar importance in our civilization and one attended in this day by peculiar difficulties. Students come to college with training in reading and writing and reckoning and a small stock of general information. The special task of the college is to teach people who have learned to read how to reflect on what they read, how to discover and estimate the premises of arguments offered to them, how to identify and try the conclusions of these arguments—in other words, how to analyze an argument or explanation and to judge of its soundness. Knowledge worth the name is something more than mere memory of facts and of favored interpretations of facts. It involves an understanding of the way in which facts are recognized and an understanding of the processes of reasoning by which they have been interpreted. To have knowledge of a subject is not merely to have memorized the conclusions which specialists in the field have reached; it requires an understanding of the principles and of the methods of work employed in the field. It is in this sense that all real knowledge involves a grasp of reasons

and that education beyond the elementary level must consist fundamentally of the examination of arguments and the practice of reasoning. To train students to analyze the reasonings of others and to develop their competence to think for themselves—this is the chief task of the college.

No task, surely, is of greater importance in a democracy than that of training its youth to use their minds as men who are to be entrusted with freedom ought to use them. It is not enough that the citizens of a democracy should be prepared merely to grasp the meaning of what is being said to them or written for them. That is simply to prepare them to be the victims of every stupid or unscrupulous demagogue whose voice rises above the din of controversy. It is not enough that citizens in a democracy should be trained as brilliant specialists. That is simply to prepare them to become effective agents for their own unexamined prejudices, or, what is worse, effective tools for blind or self-seeking leaders. It is the function of the college to develop in students who have been taught to read and to write, an ability to think. It cannot and it should not attempt to teach them what to think on all those subjects concerning which they will be expected as men and as citizens to form judgment. It should aim rather at developing such habits of thought as will make it profitable for them to think independently. It is only as this task is well done that the democratic way of solving social and political problems has a fair chance of success.

One great obstacle to the performance of this task is the fact that the three parts of the educational system I have been describing may be easily telescoped so as practically to eliminate the proper work of the college. People who have been taught simply to read and to write and to figure can be transferred directly to specialized training, and unfortunately they often are. They have the tools for it. Having mastered the elements of reading and writing and mathematics, they may be inducted immediately into a special field and given a high degree of narrow competence within that field. This possibility constitutes a serious threat to our civilization. Unless we are aware of the danger and wise in avoiding it, we may very well develop, as some other countries have developed, cunning specialists and skilful technicians whose cunning and skill are at the command of any evil political power that may arise.

Because of this possibility the American college must fight for its place in our educational system and, having secured it, must resist every encroachment from other parts of the system. It must know what it is doing, why it is doing it, and how it may best be done. It must frame with all the wisdom it can muster a program designed to teach people to think profitably for themselves. Its program must be a program of liberal education aimed at producing men trained for wise and independent action.

The proper period in the life of a student for such an education should not be hard to fix. It ought to begin as soon as the necessary elementary

training can be accomplished and as soon as a student's faculties have matured sufficiently for its purpose. It should be as concentrated and efficient as possible, so as to allow those students who desire a specialized training to complete that training at a reasonable age and to make it possible for others to enter upon non-specialized work without waste of time.

Nine or ten years of schooling ought to be enough to prepare for it and would be ample if grade schools, high schools, and preparatory schools eliminated waste from their programs and devoted themselves to their important and essential task. Most young people should be sufficiently mature at what is now conventionally the sophomore year of high school to profit from it. There is indeed, as has long been recognized, a natural break at what is now for most students the middle of a high-school career, and it is at this point that college work, of the kind described, ought to begin. The work of the college can be done in three or four years, leaving ample time for the specialist to secure his training and for the non-specialist to serve his apprenticeship before shouldering the responsibilities of his place in society.

It is for these reasons that the College at the University of Chicago begins at what is conventionally the middle of high school and ends at what is ordinarily the sophomore college year. Given this period, the College can, for the average student, perform its task easily. It believes that it can accomplish its task in less time for students who have been graduated from good high schools.

The program of liberal education which the College at the University of Chicago has framed assumes that people learn to use their minds best when they are forced to exercise them on different subject matters, and that in the course of such exercise students may be expected to acquire the information concerning major achievements in various fields of knowledge that every educated man should possess. The College program includes, therefore, three years of work in the natural sciences, a three-year course in the social sciences, and a three-year course in the humanities. Students who enter the College at the end of the conventional sophomore year of high school pursue these three lines of study concurrently through the first three years of their work in the College. They take a two-year course either in the biological sciences or in the physical sciences and follow it by a year course in the other field. They take a three-year sequence of courses in the social sciences, consisting of work in American history and political institutions during the first year, and a study of economic, social, and political institutions in the second and third years. The study of outstanding social philosophies of ancient and modern times is an important part of the work of these courses. Students take in the third place a three-year sequence of courses in the humanities, designed to develop ability to understand and enjoy the products of man's imagination and thought in literature, art, music, and philosophy. The first year of this sequence is an introduction

to the various fields of the humanities; the second is devoted to history and world literature; the third is given to art and philosophy.

To these subject-matter courses there is added a three-year course in writing, in the conviction that as students acquire knowledge and learn to think for themselves, they ought to form adequate habits of expression. The College courses in English composition are designed to accomplish a great deal more than the mere weeding out of common errors in diction, grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure. They are designed to develop competence in clear, well-reasoned, and persuasive writing and to this end they devote a good deal of time to the analysis of excellent examples of the art of writing, as well as to the practice of it.

Finally, the College program includes a year course, normally taken at the end of the student's College work, in principles and methods, a course designed to integrate the program of the College by considering the relationships, past and present, of the various fields of knowledge and by examining and comparing the methods of acquiring and testing knowledge in each one.

The completion of the general education which these courses are designed to provide is measured solely by comprehensive examinations. Students who do satisfactory work on these examinations are awarded the Bachelor's degree.

The Bachelor's degree as at present used in this country reflects the confusion of our educational system. It has no fixed meaning. The studies which may lead to it vary widely and include specialized and professional courses of all kinds, as any collection of college catalogues will quickly show. The purely quantitative requirement of credit for four years of work beyond high school disappeared with the "acceleration" of college programs after the outbreak of war. Its translation into credit for 120 semester hours beyond a high-school diploma is likewise disappearing since some schools accept students who have completed only three years of high-school work.

Despite the fact that its possession does not signify any determinate achievement of knowledge or competence, or even any fixed expenditure of time, the Bachelor's degree is still sought. It is sought partly because it has come to be accepted as marking a respectable termination of formal education and partly because it is still supposed to represent a liberal or general education. Since the completion of the Chicago College program means both of these things, it is marked by the Bachelor's degree.

The usual schedule of work for college students at Chicago consists of four courses each year, so that most students who enter the College at the end of the conventional sophomore year of high school will have some time in their fourth college year to follow their personal interests or to begin specialized training.

The College would, of course, prefer having all of its students follow its

four-year program, beginning in the middle of the conventional high-school course and completing their work with what is ordinarily the sophomore year of college. The majority of our students, however, for the present at least, come to the College after being graduated from conventional high schools, rather than in the middle of the high-school period. The College has, consequently, planned a two-year course of study, building so far as possible on the last two years of high school and containing the major part of the work outlined above. Students who have had good high-school training in the natural sciences, in social studies, in literature and in English composition will find it possible to prepare themselves for the Bachelor's examinations in about two years by sacrificing the time which would have been open to them for the pursuit of special interests had they entered the College at the end of the sophomore year of high school. These students will ordinarily take a year of work in the biological sciences and a year of work in the physical sciences, a two-year course in the social sciences, a two-year course in the humanities, a year course in English composition, and a year course in principles and methods.

Since under present conditions some high-school graduates, particularly those who intend to specialize in such fields as medicine or chemistry, find it very difficult to postpone specialization so as to devote two full years to general education, the College has planned a second program of work leading not to the Bachelor of Arts degree but to the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy. Students who follow this program are allowed to substitute two specialized courses of a year each for two of the general courses provided in the program for the degree of Bachelor of Arts.

At a time when strenuous efforts are being made in all fields to eliminate waste and inefficiency it is particularly important that the College should know exactly what it is doing and why it is doing it. It seems likely that the demands of the post-war period for sound education will be no less exacting. Then, as now, our Democracy will require citizens trained to take their places as free men in a free society.

The Sophomoric Bachelor

By PAUL P. BOYD

Dean of the College of Arts and Science, University of Kentucky

Much of what President Hutchins has to say in connection with his proposal to award the Bachelor's degree at the end of the sophomore year is quite generally accepted as good educational doctrine.¹ For example, there is a clearly recognized change in the optimum type of college work at the end of the sophomore year. This is recognized in the junior college movement and the establishment of lower and upper divisions in many four-year institutions. We have devoted these first two years to general education or, as I prefer to say, to the completion of secondary education. We pretty generally agree, also, that if there is no efficient selection of the better students for entrance to college, fifty per cent or more of our freshmen will terminate their formal education at or before the end of the sophomore year.

We agree with Hutchins that in the upper division of the college and in the first year of the graduate school, three years culminating in the Master's degree, there should be progressively more specialization, more advanced study, more individual investigation of problems, more serious writing, more definite attempts to discover principles and formulate philosophies. This sort of procedure, no matter whether you call it university work or concentration or specialization, or merely advanced work, is going on now in every well organized liberal arts college. There is nothing new in Hutchins' ideas here.

It should be said in President Hutchins' defense that part of his proposal is sometimes overlooked or misinterpreted. Critics have charged quite unanimously that the Hutchins baccalaureate degree would bring destruction to the liberal arts college, that the college would be reduced to a junior college status. It would more probably come about that a fifth year of work, the present first year of the graduate school would be added, so that our four-year colleges would become five-year colleges, awarding the Bachelor's degree at the end of the second year, and the Master's degree at the end of the fifth. Some would, perhaps, drop their freshman and sophomore years and become three-year colleges or universities.

These changes would not mean the destruction of the liberal arts college. The American liberal arts college is an institution with important objectives, essential to our way of life. It is distinguished by methods, fields of learning, teacher-student relationships. It emphasizes the liberal, the cultural in

¹ Robert M. Hutchins. "The Junior College." *Educational Record*, January, 1938; also Robert M. Hutchins. "Ethics, Politics and Education." *School and Society*, October 4, 1941.

education. These features are inherent in the institution. Without them the college would not be liberal. The time feature is not in the same class. It characterizes the college but does not define it. It may be that the four-year period is better than any other, five or three, but certainly we should not say that Hutchins threatens to destroy the liberal arts college,

We thus agree with many of President Hutchins' ideas of education, and we sympathize with his desire to do something that will increase the efficiency of college education. But we part company with him when he proceeds to argue that since the program of general education needs restudy and reorganization, and since the junior college has so far attained only negative results, and since it needs the gift of the Bachelor's degree to establish its respectability, and since colleges are helpless to "induce" their poorer students to depart at the end of the sophomore year without the stimulus of a Bachelor's degree, we must give up the established A.B. degree or at any rate confuse its definition.

The junior college has, in the midst of the confusion of rapid growth in numbers and enrollments, made excellent progress in formulating its objectives and organizing its curriculum. It has not "so far done only a negative job," nor has it "added to the confusion of universities and colleges of liberal arts," except in taking many freshmen and sophomores away from them. The larger institutions have not been greatly concerned about this, for they were having trouble financing the work for the students they got. But the smaller (more or less) endowed four-year colleges have sometimes felt the economic pinch.

Hutchins' proposal to rescue the junior colleges from futility and to put them in a respectable place in the educational sun by presenting them with the Bachelor's degree is undesired charity and an illogical solution to the problem. The junior colleges do not wish the filched Bachelor's degree, as Eell's questionnaire to five hundred junior colleges shows. Nor do they need it, for the Associate's degree has been in existence for years and is rapidly coming into wide use, both in junior colleges and in the lower divisions of other institutions.

We must disagree with Hutchins also when he claims it is necessary to give the junior college or lower division graduate the Bachelor's degree in order to "induce" all but the select few to terminate their formal education. That is an astounding proposal to make, and trivial as an argument. It is unnecessary as a means to secure the elimination of the unfit from the junior and senior years. The fact is that a large percentage of the unfit eliminate themselves before the junior year, and another large percentage is being "induced" to leave college, without the teachers' gift of a Bachelor's degree on the last day of school. Every liberal arts college is now receiving into its upper division only those students that it wishes, for one reason or another, to keep. With the Sophomoric A.B. they would lose, not alone the

same number of poor risks, but in addition many able students who would have gone on another two years, had not their goal been moved up to the half-way point.

The strongest argument against the Hutchins proposal to grant the Bachelor's degree at the end of our present sophomore year is not that it will destroy our American Liberal Arts college. It will not. The strongest argument is that the introduction of such a plan is not needed to bring about those qualitative improvements in our colleges that Hutchins and we desire. The ailment was rightly diagnosed, but the doctor reached for the wrong bottle. The next strongest argument against the Hutchins degree is the unfortunate disturbances, injustices, confusions that will follow its introduction: confusion as to meaning of degrees, and of a liberal arts college, injustices to those who now hold the A.B., useless waste of time, energy, and money in reorganization of colleges and school systems. The proposal certainly isn't worth that much, whatever of good some tolerant observers may try to see in it.

The Bachelor's Degree—A Junior College Viewpoint

By WALTER CROSBY EELLS

Executive Secretary, American Association of Junior Colleges

The recently announced decision of the University of Chicago to confer the Bachelor's degree normally at or near the end of the sophomore year and President Hutchins' recommendation that all junior colleges do the same has marked implications for the junior college movement. In the original announcement of the plan, President Hutchins says that the junior colleges of the country which "are at present an anomaly in the educational system . . . [and] will be regularized and stabilized" if they will but do the same.

The American Association of Junior Colleges has taken no official action on the matter but plans to devote an entire session of its next annual meeting to a discussion of it. Any statement from me at this time, therefore, cannot be taken as necessarily representing the sentiment of the Association. It is only my personal opinion. As a student of the junior college movement and of higher education in general, however, I have given considerable thought and study to the various factors involved in this revolutionary proposal. As a result I have reached the conclusion that the proposed change is *undesirable, unnecessary, and unfortunate*.

First, the proposed change is undesirable, because the Bachelor's degree already has a long-standing, well-established meaning very different from that now proposed. If we could wipe the slate clean and start over again in American higher education, there might be more merit in the new plan. But we cannot wipe the slate clean. We cannot abolish history. We cannot disregard the fact that the Bachelor's degree to mark the conclusion of the typical four-year college course rests upon long historical usage, commencing with the first conferring of that degree at Harvard College in 1642—exactly three hundred years ago; that its use under more nearly uniform and standardized conditions has been greatly accentuated during the present century; that hundreds of higher educational institutions now possess established priority rights; that more than 3,000,000 men and women living in the United States today have secured the Bachelor's degree after four years of study and have at least some rights in asking that its meaning be not suddenly debased.

For many years in earlier life in the Far West I was a civil engineer. I was frequently called upon to make surveys to settle boundary disputes, to determine the correct position of line fences, and to adjust claims to common territory. I soon learned the principle of law which the legal profession

terms "adverse possession." In early days in the West, the original land surveys were made by contract and let out to the lowest bidder. Some early surveyors were none too conscientious and were sometimes more interested in making a profit than in establishing with precision the exact location of fundamental township and section corners. As a result, I sometimes found cases in which a man's line fence was as much as fifty or one hundred feet away from where it should have been if the original corners had been correctly located. But the courts have held, and with equity I think, that if a man in good faith has had undisputed possession of land for a period of years, his boundary fence will remain unchanged unless decided otherwise by mutual agreement of the parties at interest.

I feel the situation is somewhat parallel now in higher education. Hundreds of American colleges for far more than the minimum legal period have had "adverse possession" of the Bachelor's degree as the legitimate and commonly recognized boundary of their academic territory. Please note that I am not stating that this was an error in their case. I am only saying that if, for the sake of argument, we should admit that different academic boundaries might have been established originally, the principle of adverse possession is as valid for education as for real estate—if not more so. Those now possessing Bachelor's degrees (with all the rights, privileges, and boundaries pertaining thereto) have prior claims—have the rights of adverse possession. Changes can be made with fairness to all concerned only if the parties at interest concur in these changes. This I think you will find is sound legal doctrine. It is also, in my judgment, ordinary honesty, recognized ethics, and good academic common sense.

There is another very important reason why this plan seems to me *undesirable*. It is certain to engender unhappy collegiate rivalry and hostility. Not for a long time, if ever, are the four-year liberal arts colleges going to surrender their rights to the baccalaureate degree with its present meaning and to their particular types of curricula. We have heard, of course, frequent and vigorous assertions that the American college is decadent, anomalous, antiquated, and slated for the academic junk pile. I note, however, that for a dying institution it seems still to exhibit quite surprising vigor and vitality. It continues to make outstanding contributions to American civilization. I hope and trust it may continue to do so for a long time to come, I am sure the American college needs no defense from me.

The junior college also has its place in American education and in American civilization. What is that place? Is the junior college a young upstart in the field of higher education, greedily attempting to usurp the fields already adequately occupied by established institutions, or does it have a legitimate place of its own in the total pattern of American education? Is it a rival or an ally?

The first article of my educational creed for the past several years has

been that the junior colleges and the senior colleges should not be hostile rivals but friendly partners in a common cause—that they are not in *competition* but in *cooperation*. This conviction has been the guiding principle of all of my work in my position as Executive Secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges. Nor am I alone in this belief. A few months ago, in order to check my own educational creed, I secured from almost 2,000 representative educators and laymen in all parts of the country answers to the question: "Do you feel that the junior college is primarily an institution in competition or in cooperation with other institutions of higher education?" The answers were five to one in favor of an interpretation of the junior college as a *cooperating*, not as a *competing*, institution. I think I have been able to see some positive and constructive outcomes of the policy I have been trying to follow based upon this fundamental article of my educational creed.

If, however, all or even a substantial proportion of the junior colleges of the country should now follow President Hutchins' advice and begin giving the Bachelor's degree while the liberal arts colleges and universities continue their present practice of also giving the Bachelor's degree, what would happen to this friendly relationship and cooperative spirit based upon mutual respect for each other's academic rights and privileges? I cannot conceive of any procedure likely to develop greater antagonism, rivalry, hostility, misunderstanding, and academic hair-pulling on the part of the senior colleges and the junior colleges.

If the junior colleges want to give the baccalaureate degree? I do not know their attitude now, but only a year ago, before the present discussion was precipitated, I did ask them all this question: "Do you favor the Bachelor's degree at the end of junior college?" Of replies received from about 500, only about eight per cent were favorable, and many of this small minority qualified their approval in some way.

Instead of calmly attempting to appropriate our neighbor's academic property in the form of the Bachelor's degree, how much more commendable is the action of President Lowell of Harvard University a few years ago. Harvard University, in 1910, initiated the use of the degree of *Associate in Arts* to mark the successful completion of *four* years of extension work, and numerous individuals received this degree in the next 20 years. Ten years ago, however, President Lowell wrote a formal letter to the president of the American Association of Junior Colleges explaining Harvard's twenty-year use of the Associate in Arts as a four-year degree but stating that:¹

This title has been put to such general use for two years of college work that we have felt bound to abandon it and in consequence we have adopted for extension work, equivalent to a full four-years' college

¹ *Junior College Journal* 4:153; December, 1933.

course, "Adjunct in Arts." It seems wise to stake out a claim in this way to a new name for a degree, and unless you have heard of its use before, I should be grateful if you would make a note of our claiming possession of it in fee simple.

The leading American university thus did a generous and gracious thing as well as an honest and sensible thing and helped to clarify possible confusion in the field of academic degrees by formally renouncing the one which President Lowell ten years ago recognized had come to be regarded even then as the characteristic junior college degree.

In the second place, the proposed change is unnecessary. It is unnecessary principally because, as just pointed out by President Lowell, there is already a well established college degree which is more and more commonly given by junior colleges and by senior colleges and universities as well to mark the close of general education or of various specialized curricula—both at the sophomore level. I refer, of course, to the well-known Associate's degree or title, first used in this country in 1900 at the University of Chicago under the leadership of its great president, William Rainey Harper. Thirty-five years earlier, however, it was established by the University of Durham and a few years later by other British universities to mark the completion of a two-year collegiate course of study.²

I have a record, obviously incomplete, of more than 115,000 young men and young women who have received the associate's degree or title in American junior colleges in the past twenty years. Approximately 96,000 have received the Associate in Arts, one-tenth as many Associate in Science, while the balance are scattered in other fields. The Associate is now awarded in at least 245 junior colleges in forty of the forty-four states in which junior colleges are located. Fifty of these are in the territory of the Southern Association. The use of it is growing rapidly. More than half of these 245 institutions have inaugurated the practice in the past ten years—since President Lowell's letter was written. Some 14,000 students received the Associate's degree in junior colleges last year alone.

The use of the Associate's degree is also becoming increasingly common in American senior colleges and universities to signify the completion of two-year curricula of collegiate level. The University of Chicago itself awarded the Associate in Arts or Science to some 4,500 students in earlier years. The University of Minnesota has used it to mark the completion of the two-year course of study in their General College since its organization. The University of California, both in its Berkley and Los Angeles divisions,

² These facts and others in the following paragraphs are taken from a monograph which I have just completed, *Associate's Degree and Graduation Practices in Junior College*, and which was published by the American Association of Junior Colleges in August. Chapter VIII of this monograph, "Bachelor's Degree for Junior Colleges," contains an annotated list of 31 references to articles and addresses on the subject of the present discussion.

decided only this past year to abandon its former long-standing junior certificate and to confer hereafter the degree of Associate in Arts on all the thousands of students who annually complete the lower division in its major undergraduate colleges.

Following this action, the State Board of Education in California last spring granted the same right to all the forty-seven public junior colleges in the state to grant the *degree* of Associate in Arts. For some ten years previously they had been giving the Associate in Arts but calling it a *title*, if that is any important distinction—which I think it is not. Now, however, they are all to give definitely *college* degrees—but not the *bachelor's* degree. In California, where the junior college movement has had its most significant development, its institutions—both junior and senior—evidently have mutual respect for their neighbor's property rights and academic boundary fences.

Last spring three other higher educational institutions adopted the use of the Associate. American University decided to give the degree of Associate in Administration for a combination of general and specialized work totaling two standard college years. The University of Nebraska announced a group of two-year curricula to be marked by the Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, etc. The faculty of Birmingham-Southern College voted to confer the Associate in Arts at the close of their first two years of college work. A number of other colleges and universities, both North and South, have also adopted the use of the Associate's degree during the past decade.

All of the state teachers colleges in Connecticut have been authorized this past year to grant the degree of Associate in Science to students who complete general two-year curricula prior to entrance upon life activities or to professional specialization in the upper division. The same practice is under consideration in teachers colleges in other states.

Thus we find the Associate's degree or title widely and increasingly used, without criticism, by increasing numbers of junior colleges, senior colleges, teachers colleges, and universities to mark the successful completion of a two-year collegiate course of study. None except Chicago, as far as I have heard, has adopted the use of the Bachelor's degree for this purpose. Perhaps we should recall the story of the new recruit who claimed that all the rest of the regiment was out of step except himself!

When the Southern Association first adopted standards for junior colleges in 1923, it included the specific prohibition, "junior colleges shall not grant degrees." Probably at that time, almost twenty years ago, this restriction was intended to apply only to baccalaureate and higher degrees—not to the Associate's degree which in 1923 was little known or used in the Southern states. Fortunately, however, the leaders in the field of higher education in the Southern Association today have left no reason for doubt as to their present interpretation of the matter. The resolution of the Commission on

Higher Education of the Southern Association adopted at Atlanta last February, includes the statement:³

There is no objection on the part of this Commission to the use of the Associate in Arts title or degree for the completion of the equivalent of a two-year collegiate course of study, but it urges that the baccalaureate degree should continue to signify the completion of the equivalent of a four-year collegiate course of study.

With this positive declaration I see no reason why the number of junior colleges in the territory of the Southern Association conferring the Associate's degree should not be markedly increased in the next few years.

In the third place, the proposed change is unfortunate—unfortunate both in method and in time.

As to *method*, many of the readers of this statement can remember the time when conditions were sadly confused and standards were lamentably low or entirely lacking. The situation was particularly unfortunate in the South, as so well stated in another section of the Atlanta conference resolution just quoted. Academic chaos was by no means confined to the South, however. It was country-wide. There were even high schools, both north and south, which were conferring the Bachelor's degree on their graduates. One in the city of Philadelphia still follows this practice.

To correct such chaotic conditions in higher education was one of the chief reasons for the organization of the various regional accrediting associations. They have established Commissions on Higher Education, developed statements of reasonable standards, and revised and re-revised these standards in the light of developing academic opinion, critical experience, and majority judgment. They have labored continuously to apply these standards to existing institutions and have encouraged them to improve themselves to such an extent that they might be worthy to confer the Bachelor's or the Associate's or other recognized degrees with honor to themselves and with satisfaction to their constituents. They have brought order out of chaos—or near chaos.

Some junior colleges in the membership of the regional associations occasionally have wanted to conduct unconventional experiments in particular phases of education somewhat at variance with some of the commonly accepted standards. Without serious difficulty they have secured association authorization and approval of such experiments. When, however, the University of Chicago wants to do something unconventional and not in accord with the standards gradually evolved over almost a half century of organized effort through accepted academic channels, it does not attempt to secure the approval of the North Central Association, or of the Association of Amer-

³ *Southern Association Quarterly*, 6:251; May, 1942.

ican Universities, or of other similar organizations. Instead it goes ahead in the face of formally expressed disapproval of such agencies.

Again the University of Chicago proposal is unfortunate not only in *method* but in *time*. We are now engaged in the greatest world war in history. All of our resources, educational and otherwise, should be united—not divided. We are struggling for our very lives—and for the perpetuation of our free institutions, including our colleges, with their right to confer any degrees at all. Perhaps the American Association of University Women was right in their public statement characterizing the Chicago proposal as “a Pearl Harbor attack on the Bachelor’s degree.” Even if there were merit in the Chicago proposal, should it not have been postponed for sane and peaceful consideration after the war is over?

Summary. I have sketched briefly three main arguments: (1) the University of Chicago’s proposal regarding the Bachelor’s degree is *undesirable*, because other institutions have long-established and widely-recognized prior proprietary rights, and because hopeless academic confusion and hairpulling would result; (2) it is *unnecessary* because every legitimate need for a college degree can be met by the existing and increasingly common and popular Associate’s degree, which has none of the objections inherent in this unauthorized attempt to appropriate the Bachelor’s degree from its present rightful owners; and (3) it is *unfortunate*, not only in method of proposal without regard to existing educational agencies and organizations but also particularly unfortunate, perhaps even unpatriotic, in its proposal in time of war, tending to lead to educational disunity when unity is more important than ever before.

General Education, the University of Chicago Baccalaureate Degree, and the Liberal Arts Colleges

By W. E. PEIR

Dean, College of Education, University of Minnesota

The student of trends in American secondary and higher education will not brush aside lightly as insignificant the University of Chicago plan and other plans of general education. Neither will he accept or reject without careful evaluation of its significance the award of the Bachelor's degree by the University of Chicago at the end of the sophomore year. When such innovations represent a valid response to educational need, they are destined to prevail. The history of the replacement of the Latin Grammar School by the academy, its replacement, in turn, by the high school, the rise of state universities, and the recent junior college movement reveal the final success of reforms and changes based upon deeply seated educational needs of democratic America. Many such movements which succeeded were characterized by intense opposition from those in established institutions; but they prevailed because they reflected, more clearly than the practices which they displaced, the intense passion of the American masses for more, better, and higher education within easy reach and a closer relationship of education to general life needs.

The action of the University of Chicago must be considered all the more deliberately because it is one of a number of institutions like Columbia University, Ohio State University, the University of Minnesota, Stephens College, and others, where systematic and critical study of itself and of higher education as a social enterprise has taken place over a period of nearly two decades.

If, on the other hand, the new use of the baccalaureate degree is opportunistic, unfair, or uncalled-for, the practice will not spread widely. In the end the paying public will decide through its patronage of state and independent plans what suits it best. This is democratic and in our country unavoidably final, even in higher education.

It is the purpose of this article to show that the award of some degree at the close of the junior college is a logical recognition of the completion of general education as represented by high school and the first years of college education, but that the use of the current baccalaureate degree for that purpose is ill-advised and unnecessary. We shall also consider what the implication of the general education movement or the junior college movement may be for future policies in four-year arts colleges. In order to do so, it is necessary to look briefly at certain trends in secondary and higher

education which make such reorganizations as the Chicago plan, the "General College" of the University of Minnesota, and the public junior college movement seemingly logical and necessary.

Current records of college graduates everywhere show that the secondary school and the junior college curricula now perform similar functions. A few years ago I studied the pattern of general education in college and high school, respectively, of 1,000 persons—in this case teachers with Bachelor's degrees.¹ Their records were pulled at random from the files of thirty colleges and universities such as Smith College and Columbia University in the East, to Pomona College, Reed College, and the University of California in the West. They were colleges and universities representing best practices. Some of the findings were revealing and significant.

In the first place, this study showed that the subjects taken in high school and early college years overlapped much and that students started them from the beginning at either level. In terms of the actual time spent, more students who graduated from these institutions had enrolled and had also spent more time in high school than in college on English, classical languages, all languages together, mathematics, physical sciences, all sciences together, history, also on vocational subjects like agriculture, home economics, and trade and industrial arts. Of these subjects, only English and mathematics could not have been begun with full credit in college at the level on which they were begun in high school. Larger percentages of these alumni had enrolled and had also spent more time in college than in high school on fine arts, modern languages, music, biological sciences, economics, political science, sociology, philosophy, psychology, and religion. Most of the subjects of this list, too, could have been begun in high schools at the point where they were begun in college.

Thus, the junior college and the high school provide the same opportunity to get introductory courses in the principal fields of human activity and culture. Actually much work done in the first two years of college consists of work that might also be taken in high school. The two are supplementary in the total pattern of a general education. This situation is indicated by the fact found in studies that if sophomore culture examinations are given to high school seniors, the grades of the better high school seniors will overlap a large portion of the scores attained by college sophomores.

The University of Chicago has recognized this relationship in the past by allowing a limited amount of credit toward college curricula for courses taken as post-graduate work in reputable high schools. It is further recognizing the principle in its new plan by allowing high school graduates of ability and attainment to finish its first two years of work sooner, if they can

¹U. S. Office of Education. E. S. Evenden, Associate Director. *National Survey of the Education of Teachers*, Vol. III, *Teacher Education Curricula*, Bulletin 1933, No. 10. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C., pp. 201-221.

pass the final examination of general education set for the college after one year of residence, making attainment of a standard, rather than the time spent, the criterion. It has further recognized the situation by combining the junior college years with the last two years of high school into the four-year college and by allowing superior students within one year of high school graduation to qualify for admission with the status given to four-year graduates. There is a sound basis for combining or at least coordinating very closely the two levels and topping off the completion of both by a degree. The public junior college, closer to this problem than the arts college, will be destined to adopt some plan of combination, or closer articulation, once it faces what is involved. The issue is, will the final organization be called college or an extended senior high school? The purpose, general education, is that of secondary education; but the chances are it will be called the junior college or the college. The University of Chicago is setting out to call it college.

Not so defensible as supplementation in general education by these two institutions is actual duplication and repetition. According to these records, whole courses of similar title, sometimes but a year or two apart, often a whole year in length, are repeated and sometimes required at college. Examples are the survey of English literature, beginning courses in the respective sciences, world history, American history, all of which are very commonly repeated and often required. Experiments authorized by the North Central Association in the past would indicate that one such sequence for both levels would be sufficient. Thus much time could be saved for college students if the senior high school and junior college curricula were more carefully coordinated by eliminating parallel sequences.

By the amount represented in such duplications, the period of general education might well be shortened, were it not that in general the fine arts, geography, anthropology, economics, business and consumer education, sociology, economics, political science, geology, astronomy, personal and public hygiene, general preparation in nutrition, and philosophy are quite seriously lacking in the combined program of general education in both high school and college for most college-bred persons. These subjects should and will no doubt receive more attention than heretofore as a part of the general education that is best for most. They call for time. The "100 great books" of the past are fine cultural training, and such education should be a part of it all, but they do not suffice. That is why I prefer to use the word "general education" as a more appropriate and a more inclusive type of education that is needed by modern youth than the term "cultural education" which is a part of it.

There must be accomplished, in addition to an introduction to the social heritage of the past, a thorough-going introduction of secondary and college students to the social, economic, and political problems of today. They

must know the world better, geographically and anthropologically. The essentials necessary for use must be mastered. Art must be made a way of life, a constituent of the common life in home and community. The need of better personal and community health, based upon knowledge and practice habituated by higher education, has again been demonstrated by the physical and health examinations for war service. Ethical behavior and a scientific and philosophic approach to individual and social problems are worldwide needs today for social efficiency. The uses of mathematics in a technical world should be revealed better than they have been in courses that were pure mathematics with too little stress upon application. Mathematics and science too can be adapted to more people of less academic ability. All this takes time. It is more important to attain these objectives for all than merely to save time, particularly because normally many youth, at times 3,000,000 of them, were unemployed.

The close articulation, then, of the senior high schools to the junior college as the terminal level of general education for all normal persons who wish to attend school until about twenty is entirely logical. The movement is on and will grow in the future. All this implies that the functions of the high school and of the junior college are similar, which they are. They can be summarized: for those who go on to prepare for the professions, both are preparatory; for those who do not because they are dropped or because they choose to stop, they should be terminal. They should be open to all and adapted to all normal students. They supply an educational background in the principal fields of human activity.

The outcomes of such studies for the general education of the individual at either level can be briefly stated:

The development of an integrated healthy individual who is physically and mentally fit, who is ready for adult life and capable of keeping himself fit: secondary and college education should improve, not impair health;

The optimum development of native abilities as a birth right, the remediation of deficiencies, and the attainment of capacity for continuous growth, self-direction, adjustment and adaptability to changes such as are occurring ever more rapidly in our society;

The ability and habit of thinking constructively within one's spheres of life activity at the attained level and intensity of education;

Familiarity with the social heritage of the past;

The inclination and habit of participation in the worthwhile activities of individual and group life, which include intelligent family life, community, state, national, and world citizenship;

The inclination and ability to seek relaxation in desirable forms of leisure;

The attainment of a personal philosophy of life, which Americans desire to be democratic, which the Christian desires also to be spiritual and religious;

The development of inner resources of culture, wide interests, emotional sensitivity, and the desire to know and to learn more.

The outcomes of such general education in high school and junior college for society should be family, community, state, national, and world progress—cultural, spiritual, economic and political, under the democratic philosophy as the most ethical way of life we know. The better educated man with the kind of general education he should have should fit naturally into such a social program. All these aims constitute the burden of general education wherever and whenever it occurs. They are the constituents of the “good life” which should be promoted through education, as long as it continues. It is quite logical that a period of education with these general aims should be topped off by the award of a degree.

There is another, and a very important aim, of the total program of higher education, just as for many students of secondary education at a lower level. This is preparation, or progress in preparation, toward beginning to earn a living and to take responsibilities as an adult by the close of the period of education. For this direct vocational training in the trades, business, and professional or pre-professional education, specialization in advanced or technical studies with a vocational aim in view must take place in or out of college for the college man. It can be done parallel with general education over a longer period or it can be done after general education is completed. Whether specialization should be concurrent with or follow general education is a debatable issue. The university set-up, the indecision of youths on vocational choices, and their need for guidance point to its pursuit following general education. But since all do not take the entire course of general education and many must have vocational education earlier, there is an issue, and a problem.

The high school has included as much general education for those who want vocational training as possible in vocational curricula that continue throughout its length. The small public and independent junior college is restricted to an academic college preparatory course, which seldom satisfies all of its constituency except those who plan to go on to a senior college elsewhere and use the junior college for preparatory purposes and background. The university with its professional schools and pre-professional courses for students who have come there for general, or for general and vocational, education, has, as does the University of Chicago, tended to concentrate general education in the first two years, and to begin specialized and professional training in the last two years of the senior college level. Thus, it can articulate with the high school and the junior college, but it does not serve many

who never go or who drop out because they want to get ready to do something. The teachers college has paralleled and sometimes integrated general education and professional education throughout its four years of college; but there is a strong trend, criticized by many, to adopt the plan prevailing in universities. This is done partly in imitation of universities but also to articulate better with the growing number who wish to transfer from public junior colleges. Being state institutions, they tend to fit into the public and state systems of high school, junior college, and university organization. However, there are many superintendents employing teachers who are certain that teachers from the four-year professionalized curricula are superior in professional attitude and ability to those who have only two or even only one year of more concentrated professional training. The principle of the advantage of distributed learning over concentrated learning is on their side. The complete separation of general from vocational education is thus still an issue of higher education that is not conclusively settled. It is getting more acute as more and more citizens of a democracy growing ever more complex need more and more general education of a higher level.

The liberal arts college has traditionally emphasized four years of cultural education, and it has resisted but not prevented the incorporation of vocational and pre-vocational education; it now does much vocational and pre-vocational work. For example, forty per cent of the graduates of the smaller independent arts colleges have completed the professional courses for teaching. These professional courses have often been opposed by faculties as out of place or unnecessary; but state regulations, sponsored by the teaching profession, have left the arts college little or no choice in the matter unless it chooses to lose students, which few can afford to do. State education has insisted that the child, the institution, the profession, be studied and that there be supervised induction into teaching. This has been the cause of no end of controversy for over fifty years. Many arts colleges now offer specialization in music, journalism, library science, civil service, pre-law, pre-medicine, pre-technical, clerical work, nursing, etc. There are few which do not in some way or other incorporate a considerable amount of vocational or pre-professional work. For the termination of general education in four rather than two years, the baccalaureate degrees, the A.B. and the B.S., are awarded, and they frequently include much vocational and pre-vocational content. Their most characteristic meaning, however, is four years of college in which such vocational work may or may not have been incorporated. They do, however, signify much more than one or two years of cultural education as represented by the junior college; they include most of four years in any event, and there is enough content available to justify such emphases, for some if not for all.

And now the University of Chicago has, without much consultation of others and quite independently, appropriated these degrees to mark the

close of general education as such by the end of the sophomore year; that is, after two years or less of standard college work. Quite legitimately the four-year arts college is concerned.

We have noted that there are good arguments why the junior college period in universities and in public junior colleges might terminate the emphasis on general education of the high school and of the first two years of ordinary college. To summarize, the instructional program is to a large extent a supplementary one, to some extent an actual duplication, and to a less extent than often assumed, a continuation of courses begun at the secondary level. The aims are similar. Vocational and pre-professional courses and curricula are frequently included. The chief differences between high school and early college years are that the same ground is covered more quickly and elaborated more in college, that more advanced courses are available, and that about two-thirds of the faculty has had a longer period of preparation, a little more than one year more in graduate schools; and there are other reasons. The college preparatory work of public junior colleges can articulate directly with the professional schools and with advanced work of the senior college of the college and university for specialization. The period of formal education can be considered closed at that point for most people.

The University of Chicago plan with all this in mind, by combining the last two years of high school and the first two years of college, is performing a legitimate experiment for scientific evaluation, to which no one can object. It anticipates and encourages the 6-4-4 organization by adopting it. It has been advocated for public school systems with junior colleges that operate 6-3-3-2 or 8-4-2 plans of so-called elementary, secondary, and junior college education because such an organization will either eliminate one school division and reduce the problems of articulation by that amount or it will equalize the length in years of the several schools in the series.

Furthermore, and somewhat related to the problem, it is entirely conceivable that with a post-war trend to retain the nursery schools now being established, in addition to the kindergartens, we may also evolve a 4-4, pre-school and elementary plan in years to come, out of the present 1-1-6 pre-school, kindergarten, and elementary set up. Combining the two proposals we would have pre-school, primary, elementary or intermediate, junior high-secondary, senior high, or general college education periods of 4-4-4-4 years, respectively, with two or three years of senior college ending with the Bachelor's or the Master's degree, and with the graduate school for the doctorate on top of that. Anything of that sort based on successful try-out and evaluation may get started. A good case can be made for the four-year schools. A study of school organization since colonial days in America indicates that such changes in organization have occurred gradually once or twice during

each century and that no school organization has ever been held sacred enough to preserve.

The attack upon this problem of the re-organization and articulation of all levels of education, but particularly of secondary and higher education, is considerable and bears some promise of success. Young people are destined to stay in school longer to escape idleness, to profit by more general education of the sort that they can master at each ability level, to secure a larger base of knowledge, insights, and interests for more intelligent citizenry, in order to meet the obligations of citizenship, and for many to get vocational training. That is what lies ahead of us. For this reason the junior college, more closely articulated with the senior high school than is the four-year college, usually nearer home and within week-end commuting distance, and also cheaper in tuition, when not free, will become much more prevalent throughout the United States. It will also respond quickly to the provision of adjusted curricula of general education, terminal vocational courses with general education emphasized, and pre-professional curricula. It will likely be devoted to the principles, however, that vocational and professional education should always be delayed as long as possible and that when offered early, it must be accompanied by the best possible courses of general education. The independent four-year colleges have the privilege of being selective, each to select its own function and, if it chooses, to educate the most capable only, or to emphasize cultural education only, in two or four years. This problem of more general education for more normal and less superior people however must occupy their attention too as part of the total program of American public education.

The University of Chicago has been quite realistic in noting all these trends for its own distinctive purposes, plans, and function. It is conscious of the similar aims of the senior high school and of the junior college for those who enter the professions. It opposes mixing of cultural and vocational education. It insists upon broad education as a prerequisite to the professions and scholastic specialization. It is not attacking all angles of the problem faced by public junior colleges such as terminal vocational curricula combined with general education at an earlier level nor for more functional general education for those who do not go on. It does leave the junior college open to a larger number of those who want more education, and it adjusts to the individual differences among college students by permitting the superior to advance faster and for the slower, more normal minds to take more time to attain the same minimum standard of work. It does attack the fundamental problem of making the student more responsible for his own educational progress. It does emphasize a terminal level for the general education of many. It has determined, and I believe wisely, upon careful selection after that period by professional schools and by advanced departments of those

who are more capable of meeting more rigorous standards of scholarship. It emphasizes perhaps too exclusively purely intellectual development as measured by verbal examination. It probably ignores the time factor and social and emotional maturation by making it possible to get a Bachelor's degree after one year of college, if the examinations are passed. Quite properly, the University of Chicago wants a degree at the point when its conception of general education must terminate for most people and where specialization, advanced work, and professional preparation begin for a more selective group. All public junior colleges, many junior colleges in arts college, and universities face that problem of providing a suitable award in the form of a degree, because the American college public measures attainment in higher education by the degrees held.

The University of Chicago, however, has been unfair to 600 or 700 colleges and universities which award the baccalaureate at the end of four years, at the close of the senior college, by now awarding that degree at the close of the junior college. Its arguments for that step are not nearly so convincing as are the educational arguments for its plan of general education. With a divided faculty on that point, a scant majority it has boldly taken a respected degree, because it has prestige, and has demoted it, instead of making another suitable degree respected by putting the prestige of the University of Chicago back of it. That is the way it looks to college alumni everywhere who hold that degree and to the institutions which award it. The step was ill-advised and will lead to confusion.

Let us briefly consider some arguments for Chicago's action on the baccalaureate degree. One point is that this degree should be used to terminate the usual period of general education. The baccalaureate degree means four years of college education that are largely cultural, but we have noted that it no longer has meant four years of purely general or cultural education; it does mean four years of college, with at least a major emphasis on general education. Another argument is that at present it is not standardized at all. Of course, its quality differs from college to college or from person to person; so does the quality of any degree, as long as institutions differ among themselves as much as they do. What standardizes the baccalaureate is the four-year concept—the few institutions which award the A.B. earlier, notwithstanding. The University of Chicago now wishes to use it for a four-year period of general education, ending with the sophomore year; and if other colleges, public and private, award it at the close of the second year, then in these other institutions it will not mean general education any more than it does now. Vocational courses and vocational curricula will and are in the picture. It will mean two years of college as now considered, largely cultural. President Hutchins has urged public junior colleges to use the degree and public junior colleges would then award it for a miscellany of curricula. It would not standardize the terminus of general education at all.

Other degrees like the A.A. or the A.L.A. are available. For much the

same reason, educationally, other institutions have used these degrees. The University of Minnesota, for example, awards the A.A. at the close of the General College and will award, by recent action, the A.L.A. at the close of the second year in the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts for those who want it and who qualify for it. The University of Chicago would have enhanced the whole general education movement, as well as the junior college movement, by using one of these available degrees, without confusing the situation more than it needed to be, and without offense to other colleges.

Another reason for the use of the A.A., the A.L.A., or similar degrees as terminal for general education, largely cultural, and reserving the baccalaureate degree for four years of general education, largely cultural, is that in the future, as in the past, hundreds of thousands of capable young persons will want more general education than that which the two years is planned for. They will want it as selected, more capable individuals who have time for more preparation for living. There is so much more of education available; many can do it profitably by the expenditure of two more years of time. For these, the American arts college, either independent or incorporated in a university setting, should have its traditional degree preserved. Thus far arts colleges have not declined in enrollment in spite of the junior college movement, and they will not even though one holds, as do the junior colleges and professional schools, that for most persons professional education can and should begin two years earlier. It is likely that professional schools which select most carefully may give preference to those with four over those with only two years—other things being equal.

The arguments for three years of senior college beyond the junior college for specialization and for professional work ending with a Master's degree is a valid one for the University of Chicago and for others too. Chicago has the kind of undergraduate clientele which emphasizes graduate work and professional preparation. Many other universities do the same, but the bulk of four-year colleges and some universities are not ready for such a step. The University of Chicago should have left them the baccalaureate degree for the curricula of four years. Future alumni will not have to ask one another whether they have a "two-year" or a "four-year" Bachelor's degree. Even the University of Chicago alumni will experience that confusion in years to come.

However, the extended college and university curricula under the 2-3, the five-year-integrated, or 4-3, plans, respectively, in which the last figure includes the fifth year of five years of college, do loom up in the picture. Arts colleges with an eye for the future should soon see an opportunity that exists, and that opportunity is not attributable at all to the Chicago action, for extended educational service of three years beyond the junior college. While some should now choose to limit themselves to the junior college level and others may continue with four-year curricula as before, many have a

new, enlarged future under the 2-3 or the 4-3 plans by which these may run parallel with present four-year organizations. They can grant any of the degrees, A.A. or A.L.A., A.B. or S.B., or some form of the Master's degree for the appropriate curricula of varying length. In this connection I am not necessarily speaking of the research degree of graduate schools as the sort of Master's degree to be granted, but of Masters of Education, Masters of Journalism, Masters of Civil Service, Masters of Music, Masters of Commerce or Business, etc., in which the equivalent of a year or less of vocational or academic specialization for a limited range of vocations are combined with about four years of the sort of education arts colleges like to give. These degrees can develop a large clientele and will satisfy youths who everywhere as freshmen respond, when "questionnaired," that they "go to college to prepare for their life work." All this cannot be done well in four, and it can be done much better in five. Arts colleges need not sacrifice their cultural purposes nor need they lose students for the junior year to transfer to universities to get vocational training.

This movement may soon establish itself with certainty. For example, five-year college curricula for secondary teaching are demanded now in a number of states and cities. We cannot prepare in four years a secondary teacher (1) with an adequate spread of general education as represented by the high school and the junior college, (2) with specialization in a broad teaching field or two,² and (3) with adequate study of education as an institution and as a process of individual and of social development. School teachers and administrators are recognizing this in their experience in public education. On the average about 40% of small arts college students prepare to teach. Thus, the five-year curriculum is definitely shaping itself through social and professional demand. The university now, and the teachers college later, will respond. What will arts colleges do? Arts colleges and universities now are in most cases teacher-preparing institutions, which have not always taken the matter seriously enough, although they furnish 40 per cent of all the teachers in the nation. Similarly, future secretaries, homemakers, nurses, journalists, civil service employees, department store employees as buyers and executives might take part, if not all, of their vocational education together with a complete cultural program in the advanced courses now offered in arts colleges without the sacrifice of broader education, if the period of preparation is extended to five years with a Master's degree.

In the light of all these considerations, then, there can develop several sorts of successful arts colleges. Each can suit its clientele, each can adjust to the program of public education as it is developing in state and independent institutions before our eyes. Some, like Stephens College and the

² Two-thirds of high school teachers teach not in two or more subjects like history or chemistry, but in two or more broad fields like science or social studies.

University of Chicago, may develop a four-year institution, including the last two years of high school and the first two years of college, which enrolls students between the ages of 16 and 20. They can emphasize cultural education or include vocational work according to their chosen purposes. They will articulate with the sophomore year of the four-year high school, the first year of the senior high school and as universities with the last year of the four-year junior college described above and with all other junior colleges. As higher institutions they will call it college and so may ultimately public school systems with the 6-4-4 plans. Other arts colleges can articulate with high schools as they are and institute 2-3 plans with the A.A. or the A.L.A. at the end of the junior college, and the A.M., the M.S., the M.Ed. and other degrees signifying both general education and a year of vocational preparation at the end of the fifth year. Many larger colleges can use the 2-3, the 2-2, and 4-3 organizations simultaneously, somewhat as Chicago is doing with its two plans.

Under such programs, a pure A.M. degree can signify even more education of the general, humanistic sort, the M.S. even more education of the general and scientific sort than the baccalaureate, while the master's degrees of education (M.Ed.), music (M.Mu.), journalism (M.Jr.), nursing (M.Nu.), civil service (M.C.S.), distributive occupations (M.Di.), etc. would signify more education of the general sort than does the A.A. or A.L.A., with recognition of the incorporation of correlated vocational or pre-professional work over a longer period. We need a period of tryout and evaluations of all such plans, and arts colleges can secure the future and perform a still greater service to general or cultural education by considering these possibilities. If certain principles are kept in mind, and articulation is maintained with the entire ladder of an evolving, complete system of public education, there will be no confusion. Experimentation now should result in much educational progress. Those who wish to select and confine themselves to a four-year plan of cultural education should also have the right to do so.

The great concern of the arts college in the next few decades should not be what experimental plans at odds with current practice may be tried, but how it may adjust to and even anticipate the growing need for a functional, liberal education for more people, which the great period of reconstruction after this global war will bring to all of us. Since youth will stay in school longer, since youth must be prepared for increasingly complex tasks, the proper relation of liberal and vocational education for living and making a living must be their concern. In life they are closely allied—why not in more colleges of the future? If colleges solve the problem of their relation to social movements in the way they can, and if they fit themselves into the total development of American education, as it is going on, there need be no immediate concern of survival, service, and respectability.

During the period of adjustment that lies ahead, the baccalaureate degree should be reserved for the four-year and not used for two- or five-year curricula, because four-year institutions will continue for a long time. The action of the University of Chicago on the degree, therefore, was ill-advised and at best premature.

A Bachelor's Degree for Sophomores

By WILLIAM PEARSON TOLLEY

President, Allegheny College

Sweeping reforms have their best chance for success in times of rapid change. During the war years there will be many new approaches to educational problems, many lessons to be learned from experiments in acceleration, many advances in methods of instruction and administration, many changes in the curriculum, in tests and measures, and in educational goals. Much will be learned by critical self-study, but perhaps even more by a study of the new training programs of industry and the armed forces. Supplementing our schools and colleges are gigantic new educational agencies that are requiring a learning rate undreamed of by academicians. All about us are new laboratories of learning and instruction.

Some of the changes that are now taking place may be better suited for war than for peace. Acceleration and continuous schooling may be weighed on different scales when the war is over. Even the lessons taught by industry and the army may need adaption rather than bodily transfer. And many an ill-considered plan now advanced by high authorities will be recalled with an indulgent smile when the confusion is over and sanity returns.

Among the proposals for educational reorganization is the attempt by the University of Chicago to make junior colleges of the four-year colleges of liberal arts and give the Bachelor of Arts degree at the end of the present sophomore year. Such an undertaking would invite certain failure in normal times. Now, however, when the waters are muddied by acceleration and the tides are running against the humanities and the liberal arts, the prospect of success may be somewhat better. Certainly it is the ideal time for a "sneak punch" such as this plan is. More important matters now engage the attention of the colleges. Busily occupied with the manifold problems brought by the war, most administrative officers have little time or energy to worry about the eccentric behavior of a sister institution or to organize a defense against counterfeit degrees. Most of them feel that this is a problem that will have to wait until the war is over.

Although the proposal of a cheapened baccalaureate has been condemned by the Association of American Colleges, the National Association of State Universities, the National Conference of Church-Related Colleges, the Association of Colleges and Universities of the Pacific Southwest, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and the American Association of University Women, there is every evidence that the University of Chicago will carry out its an-

nounced plan and give the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Philosophy degrees at the close of its lower level or junior college program. For the time being, it will not give the Bachelor of Science degree for junior college work. Apparently the science faculty at Chicago does not share Mr. Hutchins' enthusiasm for two-year degrees.

Because of the prestige of the University of Chicago and the bold challenge of Mr. Hutchins to the various associations of schools and colleges there are many who have wondered if the new Chicago degree does not have some hidden merit not evident on the surface. The fact that some Chicago students will enter the new college at the beginning of the eleventh public school year and follow a unified course for four years has been singled out in support of this view. Unfortunately, however, there is nothing remarkable about the four-year program except the small percentage of Chicago students who will enter at the eleventh year. Even in Chicago, young people attend public high schools, and they study the same subjects that are offered in the new junior college at the University of Chicago. It is therefore expected that most of the candidates for the Chicago baccalaureate will be high school graduates whose sojourn in college will be for two years or less.

It may be that there is merit in the break Chicago has made with vocational and terminal courses. Unlike the vocational junior colleges, Chicago plans to concentrate on basic skills and disciplines. It will devote special attention to English composition and to habits of reading and thinking. It will try to develop powers of self-expression and thought rather than to impart perishable knowledge. This seems to indicate a change in policy at Chicago, since the distinguishing feature of the former program was the use of tests that measured primarily knowledge. Thus, except for its fear of vocational and pre-professional courses, Chicago is closer to current secondary and junior college practice than it has been before.

When the accrediting agencies penetrate the mystery of the Chicago proposal of a four year course beginning at the eleventh public school year, they will find a reasonably good junior college. The students at Chicago are well selected and the faculty is, of course, distinguished. The graduates who receive the new Bachelor's degree will probably compare favorably with many college sophomores. This, however, is all that the accrediting agencies will find. They will find no senior college, no advanced study, no major subjects or fields of concentration, no honors work, no close acquaintance with any subject matter field, and no assurance of intellectual maturity. They will find a curriculum that has breadth without depth. In short, they will find exactly what they find at other preparatory schools and junior colleges: a general, but not a liberal education.

The issue, then, is clear. There should be no pretense that what is good for Chicago is bad for other junior colleges, or that what is bad for junior colleges is good for a great university. The issue is the value of the senior

college, the value of a liberal as distinguished from a secondary or general education. President Henry M. Wriston of Brown University put his finger on the weakness of the Chicago plan when he described it as "bold in appearance and weak in substance," and observed that it was "reminiscent of advertisements for learning to play the zither in six 'easy' lessons."

As the editor of this *QUARTERLY* pointed out in the May, 1942 issue, "the vice of the proposal is precisely the vice that in commercial advertising the nation tried to remedy in the Pure Foods and Drugs Act of 1907 and in subsequent laws against mis-branding articles for public consumption. [And false advertising generally.]"¹ The Chicago degree is not by any stretch of imagination a proper Bachelor of Arts degree. It is only intended to have the meaning and value of the certificate or degree of Associate in Arts. There is a moral question here that glib speech will not answer.

The origin of the plan, so ably discussed by President W. H. Cowley of Hamilton College in the April *Educational Record*, and again in the June *Atlantic Monthly*, is not without significance. As Mr. Cowley reminds us, this is not a new quarrel. It is not the first attempt that has been made to kill off the American college of liberal arts. Since 1852 there have been at least eleven attempts either to reduce the college course to three years or to dispose of it entirely by assigning the junior college to secondary education and the senior college to the university. In this latest attempt, the same arguments are used that have been presented so many times before.

In almost every case the motivating force has been American admiration for European education. Because of our cultural dependence on Europe, we have been told that if we could reconstruct our entire school and college system so that it resembled German, French, or English education, it would be a great step forward. In the first effort to dispose of the four-year college and reorganize American education, President Henry P. Tappan of the University of Michigan used the Prussian system as the example America should follow. In this latest attempt, President Hutchins uses two models: the English public schools and the German universities.

Mr. Hutchins prefers the educational systems of the old world because of three important differences between European and American education. He is impressed, first of all, by the fact that European boys seem to be more advanced intellectually than our American young people. "In this country," he says, "students are delayed two years all along the line. And two years is about the difference in intellectual maturity between an American student and an English, French, or German boy of the same age." There are other differences too, which Mr. Hutchins is careful not to mention, some of which are not to the advantage of the European boy. Perhaps if all the English, French, and German youth were given the opportunity for

¹ *The Southern Association Quarterly*, 6:318; May, 1942.

higher learning that is open to American youth, we could discuss this question with greater profit.

Mr. Hutchins likes the European schools not only because students graduate at an earlier age, but also because the program of the schools is narrowly intellectualistic. Unlike America, Europe has had little interest in the education of the whole man. Our attention to education for health, for emotional balance, for social adjustment, for spiritual and ethical sensitivity, and for citizenship and family life has been almost entirely missing in European schools, and Mr. Hutchins feels it might well be dispensed with in America.

While his attack seems aimed primarily at the liberal arts colleges, he is ambitious to reorganize the primary, elementary, and secondary schools as well as the four-year colleges. Perhaps time could be saved by a reorganization of the public schools. Perhaps it is also true that more attention should be given to the tool subjects and the fundamental intellectual disciplines. Nevertheless, there is no likelihood that American schools will follow the exclusively intellectualistic direction recommended by Mr. Hutchins. Americans are too sensible to limit the responsibility of education to the training of the mind. More and more they are coming to see that

Light is not light that lights
Only a part, with cold moon brightness, leaving
The rest to darkness and the whole to the storm.
Light, that is light, is light for the whole man.²

The third attraction of European education for Mr Hutchins is the emphasis on specialization of the German university. No one can deny that this emphasis is largely responsible for the rapid technical and scientific progress both in Germany and in the United States. It is also responsible for the rapid development of our large American universities. What is good for a graduate school or a research laboratory, however, it is not necessarily good for a school or a college. Nor is an exaggerated specialization good for the country. A Fascist state may need nothing but specialists but a democracy needs men who are well-balanced, broadly educated, and with a lively interest in their community, their nation, and the modern world.

While the American universities have followed the general pattern of the German universities, the four-year colleges of liberal arts have continued to interest themselves in the well-rounded development of their students. They have been interested in the co-education of mind and body. They have assumed responsibility for religious training. They believe in the importance of character as well as intelligence. Out of long experience they have learned the importance of intensive and advanced study, but along with specialization they insist upon a wide distribution of courses and cultural

² Hermann Hagedorn, *Harvard Tercentenary Ode*, 1936.

interests. General education continues long after specialization has begun.

It is characteristic of the American graduate school to reverence specialized research and to disparage broad, liberal learning. In his desire to get general education out of the way as soon as possible, and to give specialization the complete right of way, Mr. Hutchins reflects the point of view of many graduate professors. It is easy to explain his dislike for the American college of liberal arts. The American college does differ from the German gymnasium and university. It does delay post-graduate specialization. It does add a liberal to a general education. But it also happens to be ideally suited to meet the needs of a democracy. Its great service is to make men free. Mr. Hutchins feels that two years of college is enough. The experience, however, of the medical schools does not support him. The experience of the divinity schools does not support him. Nor does the testimony of college students support him. This is a day when even the best education has not proved good enough. It is a day when more education is needed, not less.

Education may be quickened, but we must not be too much in a hurry. The slow ripening of human minds differs from an assembly line. We have to deal with the stubborn fact that maturation takes time. I like the following story by Dean Herbert E. Hawkes of Columbia University:

"A little boy had been to Sunday school and learned all about God. He was speaking with his father:

Little boy: Daddy, can God do *anything* that he really wants to?

Father: Yes, my son, God can do anything.

Little boy: Could God make a two year old cow, just in a minute?

Father: Yes, God could even do that if he wanted to.

Little boy (after reflection): But he wouldn't be two years old, would he?"

There are some things that even the great University of Chicago cannot do.

The Liberal Arts College and the War

By GUY E. SNAVELY

Executive Director, Association of American Colleges

The American four-year college is unique! It has no exact counterpart in any country, although the Canadian college does have a very close resemblance. In other countries they have two-year colleges, giving courses in general education that are somewhat like our junior colleges. In Germany they are called "gymnasias," in France "lycées," and in South America "lyceos." Like all other American institutions which have distinctively national characteristics, the college is being subjected to severest tests by the War. Advantageous changes will evolve. The college will and must survive attacks from enemies without and foes within. Here and there a four-year college will logically become one of junior grade, others may combine, and possibly a few will expire.

In the early part of April I was called over the long distance telephone by a friend, a president of a Southern college, to give advice about a fair amount to charge the War Department for the use of his college for the duration of the war emergency. This incident made vivid the general uncertainty with which colleges face the immediate future. Upon inquiry, I was informed by my presidential colleague that his enrollment for next year's freshman class was up to capacity. He was told the Government would maintain the present equipment of the campus in good condition during the war. No new buildings of permanent nature would be constructed, although temporary barracks would be built. The faculty, students, administrative, and maintenance staffs would be expected to leave the campus *in toto*.

Where would the students go next year? Was it reasonable to expect students to return to the college when the war was over? How could the faculty be placed next year? Would clerks, janitors, maids, and other helpers be able to find suitable positions in the immediate future? How much advanced pay could reasonably be expected by employees with their lifework taken from them in a trice?

The president and his trustees are genuinely patriotic. The Army wanted at once a training center with equipped laboratories, offices, boarding and rooming facilities, with ample space for erecting temporary lodgings. Was it better as a national policy to give up temporarily, possibly permanently, a college of long and successful history, which had been a real bulwark of democracy in the education it has already given thousands who have been leaders in the cultural, civic, religious, professional and business life of the nation? Its graduates have also wielded influence beyond the seas.

If the college in question had had a staggering debt or had otherwise been in dire straits, the decision might not be hard to make. It is almost inevitable that some weaker colleges will succumb. Many students will be called by the Selective Service, others will be attracted to war industries. With the loss of fees and continued reduction in endowment income by lowered rates of interest, even the strongest colleges and universities are being hard hit.

The Navy has for some time been using the dormitories and other facilities of a number of universities. In certain universities it is maintaining from 1,500 to 2,000 men in training to become officers, the groups changing in three months' periods. In some cases only two or three large dormitories are needed. One smaller university in the far West is reported to have been taken over lock, stock, and barrel.

The state schools and an additional small number of other colleges who have had for some years Reserve Officer Training Corps are continuing these units. In these and others are being established courses for training meteorologists and other types of experts necessary in modern warfare. Faculty members are continually being called to war duties. The departments of chemistry, physics, economics, and psychology are feeling these losses more than others. The tragic side of this picture is that the professors in these very departments are particularly needed to train men for the professions and for the various types of industries where it is evident there is a growing shortage of personnel. The Selective Service headquarters recognize some of these shortages by authorizing the local boards to defer from induction in the Army men who are preparing to become engineers, physicians, pharmacists, dentists, and scientists in a number of different fields.

Further evidence of the importance of the training in colleges in the sciences, as well as in mathematics, is the V-1 program recently established by the Navy. In this program, colleges are to be approved for the training of men to become commissioned officers in the Navy, if in their first two years there is offered a specified amount of mathematics and physics and a maximum offering in physical education. Eighty thousand college students are to be enrolled in this V-1 program. At the end of the second year 35,000 of them will be chosen for further training as aviation pilots or deck officers. The latter will be continued in their respective colleges to complete their training as ensigns. Of course, emergencies may change the picture so that the men might be called earlier to service. The 45,000 college students enrolled in the V-1 program not chosen to continue for commissions in the Navy will be the reservoir for the selection of petty officers.

If the Selective Service Act should be amended again so as to drop the minimum age from 20 to 19 or lower, the V-1 program will be increasingly helpful both to the colleges and to the Navy Department.

The War Department has promulgated a program of cooperation with

the colleges whereby men can enlist and stay in college until better prepared for service in the various branches of the Army. Some men will be allowed to remain in college long enough to complete their courses. They, then, should be most likely to be chosen for the Officers' Candidate School. The Army's gravest concern is to find the best material possible for the Air Force Enlisted Reserve. Such men must have completed a certain amount of mathematics, physics, meteorology, and other college subjects. The procurement of Aviation Cadets is a most imperative need. Recent reports from authoritative sources indicate that the Army and Navy are revising their plans for college students and expect to issue a joint statement shortly.

The really sensible plan for the welfare of the nation and the quicker success of the war effort would be the immediate establishment of a Student Reserve Corps. Such a plan has been formulated by a committee working under the auspices of the United States Office of Education. The general idea has been strongly supported and urged on the War Manpower Commission by a joint committee of the Association of American Colleges and the Association of American Universities.

In brief outline the Student Reserve Corps will enroll men in standard colleges who pass stiff physical and educational requirements. The aim will be to maintain a reservoir of educated men ready for further training to become officers in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps; to continue in professional courses, *viz.*, medical, dental and engineering; to prepare for technical fields like specialists in chemistry and physics and in industrial management. After eighteen months—the end of the sophomore year on the accelerated program—all members of the Student Reserve Corps would take a "screening" test to determine whether they should continue in college for further preparation in one of the categories just mentioned or be assigned at once to a suitable branch of the armed forces. At any stage of the collegiate training the candidate may be liable to immediate transfer to service as an enlisted man if he is not maintaining satisfactory academic standing.

Members of the reserve corps should be in uniform so that they would not be considered slackers in the war effort. Those in need should be given financial aid. All passing the "screening" test for college study beyond the sophomore year should have financial consideration similar to that of an enlisted man. The British have felt the pinch so severely that they offer "bursaries" for competent men chosen for advanced study in such fields as chemistry and physics. A statement on this matter, published on authority of the British Government, appears in the May, 1942, issue of the *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*.

The proposed Student Reserve Corps obviates the devastating difficulties met in the Student Army Training Corps of the World War I. Only qualified students will be accepted, not every man graduating from a recognized

high school. Also there will be no army officers, with military drill, assigned to each college.

In addition to the satisfied feeling that their institutions are of vital importance to the war effort, colleges will learn some important lessons that will cause far-reaching changes. The chief lesson that college administrators note at once is the necessity of stabilizing the core curriculum of the lower division of the college. Fortunately the recent trend in this area is a return from a scheme of free election of courses to a concentration in a small number of subjects with some requirements specified in two or three fields. The tendency has been for most colleges to expect all students in the lower division, *i.e.*, the first two years of the college course, to enroll in such courses as English, history and other social science courses, one or more of the physical sciences, and in many cases one or more foreign languages which may be used more or less as tools in the specialized work of the upper division. In some institutions the work of the lower division or the so-called general college consists of composite courses required of all students, like "Contemporary Civilization" and "General Science."

The temptation to drift away from so-called hard courses like mathematics and a straight full year in a laboratory science like physics or chemistry is being abruptly checked by the war needs. It may be expected that it will no longer be considered progressive to allow a student, whether in school or college, to follow too much his own ignorant fancy in choosing his courses. Doubtless there will be a return to an appreciation of the necessity and the value of so-called disciplinary subjects.

Another lesson being learned is that colleges must count on the schools for certain preliminary accomplishments. The colleges should not be expected to admit students who are unable to read. They have neither the time nor the facilities to carry on instruction in this area. In the past few years considerable notoriety has been obtained by some colleges who have heralded far and wide their programs in teaching reading. Even educational foundations have been reputed to have granted considerable sums to foster such projects.

For over a generation I have heard secondary school men at association meetings wax eloquent over the theory that their curricula had been in bondage long enough to the whims of college officers who set up admission requirements. Most of these theorists have been fervid in their language. I recall one association officer some fifteen years ago getting red in the face when he stirred up his own enthusiasm by waving his arms and pacing back and forth. The colleges had already taken stock and met the situation by changing their requirement for admission. High school graduates now-a-days can be admitted to the best college if they can pass general intelligence tests, have recommendations from their school officers and other character witnesses, with a modicum of requirements of specified subjects.

Whether a secondary school graduate goes on to college or enters immediately upon his chosen lifework he must have certain minimum accomplishments. He must be able to read reasonably rapidly and intelligibly. He must express himself with clarity. He should be familiar with the more fundamental mathematical branches. Above all he should know the geography and history of his state and nation, and have an appreciation of his country's form of government. Lack of these foundations will make his experience in a high-grade college unhappy and unsuccessful.

These observations hold for students continuing their education in junior as well as four-year colleges. In the past few years there has been a tremendous advance in the enrollment in junior colleges. In many instances the junior college is a two-year addendum to the public high school. The trend is to stabilize the core curriculum of the junior college so that the education it offers is of a terminal nature and not preparatory for another type of school or college.

In addition to the necessity of curricular changes to toughen the mental development, it is crystal clear that more attention should be paid to the physical hardening of college students. At its last annual meeting held in Baltimore on January 2, 1942, the Association of American Colleges adopted a number of resolutions of far-reaching importance. The last was to the effect that "the colleges give especial attention to the building of strength and physical fitness in their students, as well as more effective training for citizenship." Reports on all sides indicate that real progress is being made in expanding the physical education programs of the colleges. This will probably mean the shift of emphasis of intercollegiate to intramural athletic sports. No longer will the average college student get his football training vicariously by yelling lustily at four or five home games while some twenty-five or thirty of his college mates get the exercise on the gridiron.

In "more effective training for citizenship" the colleges will have their greatest, a really stupendous, challenge. The American of tomorrow can no longer be an isolationist: he must be a world citizen. When we win this war—and win we must—our country will be obliged to assume hegemony among the nations. We must select one from three or more possible "ways of life." After the long, bitter struggle we may be allured to assume an imperialistic role of domination exceeding that ever attained by the British Empire; we may join with Britain in a dual scheme of overlordship for maintenance of peace and order; or, a more sensible role by far, we may take the lead in forming a world federation which would needs be implemented by a world court and world police.

The colleges and universities will be obliged to rejuvenate their courses in government, economics, sociology, and even history. Leaders must be trained who can help solve problems that have remained unstudied and have led to the present world chaos. The departments of philosophy and religion

will be impelled to reorient their thinking. They, too, may feel that they have been remiss in their past performances.

It is conceivable that a million Americans will be kept in the armed forces for months, nay, even years, after peace has come. Real statesmanship will be needed to see that the American youth will not be deprived of their birthright of a chance at a college education. A year of service to the government will be in order. This year might be taken between the ages of 18 and 22. Nor should every one necessarily be assigned to military service. Some might be given a year in the type of experience now gained in the CCC camps. Others might spend their year as apprentices in government offices. All should have a real sense of patriotic service rendered. In all types of service there should be an equal amount of opportunity for physical education. Never again should our people hear the epithet "softies" applied to them.

Another lesson being learned is that the average college student can complete his requirements for graduation in considerably less time than is now expected. Nearly all the colleges have voted to go on accelerated programs whereby at least a year can be saved by the curtailment of the long summer and other vacation periods.

Most of the stronger women's colleges are not persuaded that such acceleration is best or necessary for their students. Other educational philosophers feel that certain amount of maturation is necessary for the average student. They feel that neither the welfare of the individual nor the safety of the nation depends absolutely upon whether a boy obtains a coveted baccalaureate sheepskin before entering military service. Those who survive the War will probably be able to complete their college course, although they may think they are too old to be interested.

The experience with the accelerated programs may develop a greater flexibility in treatment of individual students. Heretofore it has been possible for a small number of brilliant and ambitious students to complete their work in three years. In the future there may be a greater tendency in this direction. On the other hand, with the economic upsets that will be inevitable, it will probably be to the advantage of the individual and of the country as well that the student remain longer in his academic training. Jobs will be scarce unless some "planned economy" is matured successfully.

The accelerated program follows three patterns—three semesters, four quarters, two semesters plus a long summer session. In all of these methods the colleges now will admit freshmen when they graduate from high school the last of January or in June, as well as in September. The net result is about the same, *i.e.*, opportunity to finish college requirements and graduate in three years or less.

At least one college has worked out an admirable scheme whereby it is still able to have a two-month summer vacation period in which the men

can continue to find opportunities for remunerative work to aid with college expenses. The ten-month academic year is divided into four quarters, three or four subjects being undertaken in each. Classes which formerly met three times a week now meet four, and laboratory periods are similarly lengthened. Time is allowed for a short Christmas holiday only. One state university has developed a similar program.

In spite of the greatly increased opportunities for college students to obtain scholarships and loans, large numbers are still obliged to obtain money for college expenses by summer work. These students will be tremendously handicapped in their desire to take advantage of the accelerated programs. The United States Office of Education through its Wartime Commission has fostered a proposal for loans and grants to students in this predicament, which has been approved by Congress with a grant of \$5,000,000.

If it becomes increasingly difficult to obtain oil and gasoline, as now is probable, it may seem advisable for colleges in the northern area to prefer to have the long vacation period come in January and February instead of in July and August. Smith, Vassar, Wellesley and Mt. Holyoke have announced some changes in line with this proposal. The weather conditions ambient in these colleges should be conducive to hard study in July and August. Students from colleges in the far South might enjoy life better and be better students if they could take their summer courses in the North. The experiment might work so well that even in normal times the problem of heating may cause the northern colleges to consider continuing the policy of long winter vacations with none in the summer.

The accelerated programs intended primarily for the period of the War throw again into focus the question of the Bachelor's degree. One well-known institution is advocating the award of the Bachelor's degree at the conclusion of the sophomore year or at the end of the lower division. It has been suggested also that the Bachelor's degree be awarded by the junior colleges. Interestingly enough, the junior colleges of California, which has more by far than any other, have recently voted to award the degree of Associate of Arts for the completion of the graduation requirements from junior college. The University of California, which in its two divisions has probably more undergraduate students than any other institution in the country, has also voted to award the Associate of Arts degree to students completing the lower division.

The preponderance of opinion is that the Bachelor's degree should continue to stand for the completion of the work of the four-year liberal arts college, as it has done since the first American college was organized over three hundred years ago. If the Bachelor's degree is to be granted just to please a group not willing to pay the price of long study, it might be smuggled into the hands of aspiring parents when the birth certificate is recorded.

When one considers the amount of professional training necessary for

doctors, lawyers, ministers, engineers, and even teachers, the time required for obtaining the Bachelor's degree might well be shortened. My own judgment is that a year could be saved in the elementary schools. The requirements might well be seven years for elementary instruction, four years for the high school and four years for the college. Students of unusual ability and ambition should be permitted to save more time, possibly one year in the high school area and one year in the college area. The consensus is that the medical schools should require four years, the law schools three, and the theological schools three years of additional work. It is certainly reasonable to expect that teachers should have at least one year, if not more, beyond the liberal arts college level. This observation would apply to teachers in the elementary as well as secondary schools.

The accelerated programs offered by the colleges are optional. Obviously most men students will be anxious to accelerate their programs so as to complete college work by the time of call to the armed forces. With the majority electing acceleration, student activities will be rudely shaken out of their regular routine. It will be unlikely that there will be such things as a junior prom or sophomore class dinner. Student affairs will be all-college in their composition. However, a senior function just before commencement is conceivable as well as a freshman party for beginning students.

College humor magazines are already folding up. The college annual may become quite different. The commencement programs are being shortened decidedly. One- or two-day programs replace the schedule of events usually requiring about a week. Baccalaureate eloquence may be reduced or eliminated.

Another lesson the colleges might learn from the War is the opportunity and responsibility they have to use their facilities. As a president at one time of a rather large college located in a thickly populated community, I felt distressed that the college buildings were used so few hours during the week. By the addition of afternoon and evening classes the college equipment was used for longer hours, and the needs of adults were met. Many were teachers interested in improving their work or obtaining additional credits for degrees. Others were attracted for cultural advancement. The colleges are the ideal centers for forums, for debate and discussion on timely and vital topics. Such forums have been proposed and pushed by the United States Office of Education in recent months.

The hardest lesson of all to learn will be how to finance the colleges. The terrific increases in taxes will present problems to state and independent colleges alike. Legislators will be under pressure to make lower appropriations for state supported colleges. The steady increase in taxes and lower rates of interest will cause a drop in larger benefactions to the independent colleges.

One solution for the situation would be an increase in tuition fees. Such an increase would tend to limit college enrollment to one class of people. Fortunately, in recent years there has been an increase in the establishment of loan funds through individuals and foundations. Scholarships should be raised to attract the brilliant through financially incapacitated students. Gifts more or less small, comparatively speaking, should be made annually by alumni and other friends of the college. This method of balancing budgets may be the best one to continue the colleges on the same high level they have enjoyed in the past. It would tend to make the college a more democratic and better appreciated, as well as necessary, feature of American life.

It has been suggested by some leaders among independent colleges that the Government give subsidies in the present crisis. Such a policy would be justifiable if assurance could be given that Government direction would not be involved. It is to be feared, however, that Government control will follow Government support. Of course, there could be no distrust whatever with regard to a grant by the Federal Government to any one or several universities for specific projects, like scientific research.

Our magnificent dual system of higher education has been the backbone of the great American democracy. The independent and the state-supported colleges are needed to supplement and complement each other in their aims to educate democracy's leaders. The democratic way of life cannot survive the waves of totalitarianism that have begun to lap at our shores and to threaten our very existence if the two-fold system, which is the genius of our educational philosophy, is unbalanced by the imposition of state supervision.

The American college has survived all our other wars. It will come through this one somehow, though chastened and determined to render higher service. The American college will abide as a pharos in a benighted world.

Some Problems Facing Secondary Schools in War Time*

Some Ill Winds

By H. T. MONCURE

Principal, George Washington High School, Alexandria, Virginia

Preparation for unprecedented enrollment in certain areas at the beginning of the past school year were logical, because there were unmistakable signs of additional families moving into these localities. When school opened and the census was taken, the total enrollment was short of what was anticipated. Checking revealed no error. Comparison with former years showed considerably more enrollment in the freshman and sophomore high school divisions than was the case the year before. This was not true of the junior and senior groups. Enlistments and employment deleted the number in the two upper grades. A problem which is likely to increase the school man's worries will result when these people return. It is true that many will not enroll in the schools after the war, though they may be in a position to do so.

Another result caused by the war in many schools is that schools are having an increase in the number of failures. Why? Doubtless, much of it is due to an increase of night and other employment. Moreover, parents are more generally employed or are participating in volunteer war work, which has relaxed home supervision. Some of the failures may be attributable to a lack of supplies, especially in the shop departments, where the A-10 priority is not sufficiently prior to get what the schools need to do an interesting and good job. Along the same line, the exodus of the shop men from the school to various industries is a contributing factor to the accelerated failures.

The question of how to combat the trouble right now is one of watching more closely the extent of the change and the degree of needed adjustment. However, the purpose of these comments is a warning that the schools will probably not need the usual additional teachers in ratio to the same increase in population as was the case in periods when unskilled and inexperienced people were not in such demand. The additional teachers and the extra supplies which appear to be needed according to the report from the chamber of commerce may be more closely pared in the new adjustment to conditions. To what degree? It will vary in proportion to the demand for pupil-age

* This symposium will be carried forward into the November issue if superintendents, principals, and faculty members of Southern Association schools wish to contribute remarks as to their present problems.—EDITOR.

workers. Localities close to war camps and industries are likely to find that the students are dropping out of school, or are failing to return, according to last year's enrollment, from five to fifteen percent over former years. The percent of failure to enter when the family transfers from one city to another is even higher.

Dallas High Schools and the Present Emergency

By W. T. WHITE

Assistant Superintendent, Dallas, Texas

Even before the outbreak of war last December, world conditions were having an effect on the curriculum and teaching problems in the Dallas high schools. Since December 7, many changes have been made in curriculum and procedure, and additional changes are contemplated.

Social Studies

The junior-high-school social science course was revised this year. The purpose of this revision was to make more definite the opportunities, responsibilities, and advantages of living in a democracy such as the United States of America. The idea of indoctrination was put into operation.

Two units, lasting two weeks each, were undertaken by all the social studies classes in the junior and senior high schools. One unit, "Americans All," was given to teach both tolerance and understanding of the minority races, and to develop an appreciation of Americanism, democracy, and our way of life. Particular attention was paid to local conditions in this study. Next fall we plan a similar undertaking, emphasizing world conditions and associations instead of local. The other unit, "What the War Means to Us," was suggested for study by Dr. John W. Studebaker, Commissioner of Education. Undoubtedly, the children and their parents had a much better understanding of the reasons for and purposes of this present conflict after that study.

Beginning next September, our principal curriculum problem concerns the social studies program. The following points are to be the bases of our study and plans:

1. Our social studies course should be an integrated three- or four-year course beginning with the ninth grade. It should be required of everyone.
2. It should have as a core continuous World History—not United States History, Latin American History, English History, or some other kind of history—but World History with emphasis on the opportunities, responsibilities, and difficulties facing the United States.
3. We should come to recognize the place, importance, and potential power of such heretofore weak countries as India and China. We are rap-

idly placing within their hands the implements of a mechanical civilization; and when they become proficient in the use of those implements and have attained a high plane of living for their people, unless we have developed friendliness and understanding with them, they can easily overwhelm us.

4. We should understand the economic interdependence of the whole world, and the tremendous importance of communications and transportation.

5. We should have a better knowledge of geography. Places and locations must be real. This section, along with 4 above, forms one aim.

6. We should develop religious and racial tolerance and understanding.

7. The possibility of postwar world peace should be based on:

a. A responsible use of power by the United States and associate nations;

b. An assumption of responsibilities commensurate with our potential strength;

c. A friendliness with other peoples, both weak and strong.

8. We should indoctrinate for democracy and Americanism in so far as own government and way of life are concerned.

Mathematics and Science

For the past several years many people outside of school circles and professional educators have questioned the need for and efficacy of so much mathematics. After Pearl Harbor we received communications from the Navy and Army advising that prospective high-school graduates be urged to take courses in geometry, advanced algebra, trigonometry, solid geometry, physics, chemistry, and related subjects so as to prepare them better for their duties as sailors and soldiers in the armed services of the United States. Our principals, teachers, and counselors have made every effort to acquaint the boys in high school of this need.

Just before school closed, Dr. W. L. Wrinkle, representing the Federal Security Agency of the Office of Education in Washington, asked that our schools participate in the national program of pre-flight training. Plans are being made to put this program of the government into operation in September. Nearly one thousand boys indicated their interest in this new course.

Two new popular courses were added to the curriculum this year, radio and photography.

Defense Work

Complying with a request from the Navy, pupils in both our junior and senior high schools constructed model airplanes.

First-aid classes were organized by the Red Cross for teachers, and later these teachers taught the pupils in the physical education or health classes.

Many high-school and junior-high-school pupils received Red Cross certificates as a result of this instruction. Next year, all pupils will be required to take first-aid work.

Carrying out a program of the Junior Red Cross, the shops and home economics classes built many useful articles for soldiers' hospitals, and did considerable sewing and knitting.

A committee appointed by the superintendent prepared a bulletin on "Emergency Instructions Regarding Air Raids and Sabotage," and all schools observed these instructions and had practice drills regularly.

Complying with the policy announced by the President and amplified by the Army and Navy, everything possible was done to encourage students to graduate before enlisting in the armed services. Other boys who were called into service with the National Guard or through the Naval Reserve were given opportunity to complete requirements for diplomas through extension examinations.

Physical Education

The number of selectees who have been rejected for service in the United States Army indicates the need for a concerted effort in building up a program of health and physical fitness in the high schools. Accordingly, a new program is being worked out this summer which will call for daily hour-periods in physical education and health. This program will be in accordance with the basic principles outlined by the University of Texas and further advised by the Air Training Corps of America. In addition to the body-building exercises, hygiene and nutrition will receive attention; and each child in high school will have a complete physical examination.

War-Time School Problems

By L. E. DUDLEY

Superintendent, Abilene, Texas

The placing of an army camp designed to accommodate 30,000 soldiers near Abilene with the consequent increase in school population in the spring of 1941 presented a real problem to the administrators of the city schools. For several years a new junior high school building has been needed. The finances of the city, under whose financial direction the schools are operated have been such that bonds could not be issued to relieve the congestion. The growth of the city as a result of the army camp increased the valuations of the city, and a successful refunding of the city's bonded indebtedness made possible the voting of additional bonds for school buildings.

It was necessary to provide for approximately one thousand pupils. The city voted bonds in the sum of \$125,000, the maximum amount possible. Federal assistance was secured in the sum of \$186,000. With this money

two junior high schools are being built and furnished. These facilities will relieve congestion in all the schools of the city and make possible greatly improved work. It's an ill wind that blows nobody good.

The Passing Minutes of a Secondary School in War Time

By L. F. GAMES

Principal, Granby Street High School, Norfolk, Virginia

Our school is pleasantly situated in a suburban, growing area of Norfolk, Virginia. The doors were opened for the first time to students in September, 1939. This was the same month and year that the Nazis began their onslaught into Poland, and tore the world apart. In the years that have come since, this school along with all other schools has seen our neutrality change to defense, and defense change in turn to the greatest war effort in history.

We are here in one of the areas where the war effort has been intensified and concentrated. A large number of our students are sons and daughters of those in the armed services or of civilian workers in war establishments. The airplanes flying continuously over the school, the searchlights which scan the skies at night, the air raid drills, the many calls upon the schools for various programs are but a few of the constant reminders that war has again come to Tidewater. Many schools in this area and elsewhere have experiences similar to ours.

Long rows of quickly built houses in the vicinity are evidences of the attempt to furnish shelter for the increasing war time population. These in turn will have their effect, creating new demands upon the schools for the children therein. New problems come in for their solutions, along with the older ones that are a part of school life, all of them magnified or brought more acutely into our consciousness by the local, national, and world situation.

The following are listed to indicate some of these problems, tendencies, or matters for special consideration in these school days in which we live:

1. Meeting the calls upon the schools by the various branches of the United States Government, and by groups who find in the schools an organized and efficient medium for furthering their programs;
2. Meeting the problems of sons and daughters of those in the armed services and others who are subject to frequent transfer in line of duty;
3. Adjusting all phases of the school to care for the larger numbers of transfer students who come from all parts of the nation;
4. Obtaining and evaluating transfer credits from many different schools, often with incomplete details;

5. Making arrangements for greater enrollments, with priorities closing out the possibility of erection of new schools, or additions;
6. Adjusting the school to the war time tempo;
7. Maintaining a democratic philosophy, so that students and teachers may be consciously aware of our war objective;
8. Operating on schedule with minimum time lost, in spite of the extremely difficult transportation problem here for teachers and students;
9. Making a master schedule which utilizes every available possibility, and allows for the defense activities of teachers and students and the use of the building and grounds for school and non-school groups;
10. Determining the emphasis on and place of extracurricular activities in and out of school in time of war;
11. Becoming familiar with new tax laws and regulations affecting schools and their activities;
12. Operating the school lunch room efficiently under the present conditions of food prices, labor, and shortage in foods;
13. Providing efficient substitute teachers, so that continuity of class work may not be too greatly impaired, for those members of the faculty who leave schools for the armed services, for higher salaried governmental or other work, or to marry;
14. Increasing difficulty of finding teachers for industrial arts and vocational courses;
15. In-service training of larger numbers of new or beginning teachers;
16. Taking into consideration the many outside duties related to defense which occupy greatly the time and energies of many teachers, such as taking or teaching first aid classes, work with the ambulance motor corps, assisting at the aircraft warning center, Red Cross work, or teaching defense training classes at night;
17. Making the school as attractive and worthwhile as possible to offset the tendency of some students to drop out to take more or less temporary jobs;
18. Keeping the war program before the students and teachers in such a manner that morale is quickened and hysteria reduced to a minimum;
19. Preparing special programs at assemblies, visual aids, etc., in the classrooms, that will be of particular value in their relation to the war time emergency;

20. Treating unrest among the more unstable boys and girls in the schools;
21. Meeting the problems of the students left more or less on their own when the parents are away much of the time in paid or volunteer work;
22. Stimulating a desire on the part of all to do the worthwhile things better than before for the sake of the general good;
23. Preparing teachers and students for possible local emergencies;
24. Encouraging the sale of war stamps in the schools as a continuing feature without campaigns or comparisons;
25. Obtaining equipment and supplies or making out with substitutes on account of the impending shortages;
26. Getting adequate custodial service for the money expended;
27. Adapting courses in the curriculum or providing new courses to have a more direct bearing upon the local and national situation;
28. Trying to foresee the future needs as well as to deal with the present;
29. Organizing groups for curriculum study and revision, keeping in mind the philosophy of the school and necessary short- and long-range policies;
30. Continuing evaluation with available criteria of all emergency and routine procedures in order that the weaker details may be strengthened and the stronger points maintained.

These are the items, among others, which are significant in Tidewater Virginia. They are familiar as problems in schools throughout the South and the United States, intensified wherever the war effort is at a peak. In this crisis, which has been defined as a dangerous opportunity, the vast majority of teachers and students are responding excellently to the occasion and are helping as far as it is in their power to solve these problems.

The minutes pass on in these war time schools, as the current events merge into fateful history. The airplanes drone overhead; and the schools look forward to the opportunities and solutions of another session.

Some War-time Problems of the Public Schools

By E. E. OBERHOLTZER

Superintendent, Houston, Texas

Like the old saying about the poor, the schools have always with them the financial problem. The problem of properly financing the schools, as viewed from a national standpoint, is becoming more and more serious as the national economy changes. The Federal Government has preempted

many of the fields of tax income which formerly were left exclusively to the state, particularly the income tax and the sales tax. The ad valorem tax is always more or less an uncertain source of income and is not a comparable index for judging the wealth of a community's assets, since there is a wide variation in assessed valuation of both real and personal property.

There is no question but that the schools of the nation will have to come to some kind of equitable basis for school support which will recognize the ability to pay in each of the three areas: the local district, the state, and the nation.

Senate Bill 1313, as amended, provides one means of equalizing the finances of schools in the various states. If funds were available as contemplated in Senate Bill 1313, and if each state would make a careful survey of its problems with reference to financing the public schools, such Federal funds could be used best for equalizing educational opportunities among the several states.

Problem No. 1. As our national economy becomes more and more involved, this problem of adequate school finance becomes more and more pressing, for as the locus of the production of national income becomes more and more removed from the locus of the need, there is little hope of adequate public school finance without allocation of national funds to public schools. So, perhaps, problem number one is the problem of adequate finance.

As a phase of this national problem for equalizing financial support of schools, there are in many parts of the United States sectional problems due to circumstances beyond the control of the state and local communities. In the South it is the differentiated Negro teachers' salary schedule. There has long been maladjustment in the schedule as between the two races. There have long been, also, greatly inferior training institutions for Negro teachers. Certainly training, experience, and cost of living are elements that should be considered in building an equitable salary schedule. If the Negro teachers' salaries are to be readjusted on an equitable basis, it would seem necessary that the Federal Government assist the South in this problem of finance. Many of the Southern states, if their wealth were assessed two or three hundred per cent of the actual value for the schools, would not have nearly so much school tax support as the richer states. This is familiar knowledge to most school administrators who have studied the problems of finance.

Problem No. 2. This problem has to do with personnel. Perhaps the schools are no more greatly affected by this war than any other areas in industry and occupations, but the schools have always been short of men teachers. Our war effort has made heavy demands and will continue to make heavier demands for men teachers as the war effort increases. It is true that many places can be occupied by women and, no doubt, the policy of our

nation will be to increase more and more the women as substitutes for the work formerly done by men. Yet, there is a growing shortage in special fields of teaching which cannot be supplied by women, physical education for boys, industrial arts work, and certain phases of administrative work, as well as certain special areas in mathematics and science, both on the secondary and college level. The problem of meeting these needs is somewhat like the problem of industry and other occupations. Conversion after the duration will become still a greater problem for the schools.

All of this sums up to the problem of long-reaching effect on our national welfare. We should not debate the necessity of keeping schools up to standards, and, in fact, increasing the efficiency of the schools during war time. However, the war-time effort, by virtue of its emergency, will place emphasis upon certain types of education that may, in the end, be found shortsighted in that many inequalities in the supply and demand for workers are increased.

We cannot afford to effect a blackout in fields of public life and welfare which give us trained and skilled workers in war time but which require complete readjustment in the conversion to a new economy. For this reason, trained workers must be broadly trained in areas which will permit them to shift from one phase of their skilled training to occupations of similar kind.

It would seem to me, therefore, that we should be planning an educational program to emphasize more and more the necessity of basic training in families of occupations so that when the great shift of industry and new occupations comes, skilled workers, as well as scientific workers, will have been prepared for this readjustment period.

There is a tendency now to neglect the fundamentals in the great cultural fields, as well as in the scientific fields. This neglect is sure to produce a shortage in brain power and skilled workers in these highly specialized fields.

Recent reports estimate our national income at 115 billions. This is more than triple our income at the lowest ebb during the depression. The only hope for an equitable national economy is to keep this national income at a high level. If this problem can be met, the burden of the huge war debt and other costs will be not nearly so heavy. However, the level of the national income is dependent upon work for all those who can work, and consequently new industries and new fields for work must be created after this war crisis has subsided. For this reason, public education needs to be looking ahead toward formulating a program of readjustment and conversion through educational training which will enable the nation to go through the transition period with the least of tragedy and human suffering. Therefore, we must not ignore public education in its relation to our national economy in the long-planned program.

Problem No. 3. This problem involves a broader and more effective preparation of youth for the duties of citizenship and international service. It

is a part of the national program of education of youth altered by the lessons from our present war efforts.

I would never advocate the preparation for perpetual war, and yet I would hesitate at any time to join the utopians who feel that we can educate for eternal peace. The history of the world tells the story of the struggle of the human race. It is an eternal struggle for survival, and I am sorry to say, in many cases, for the survival of the selfish interests. We should benefit by our mistakes. We are learning now, and we are suffering deeply for the mistakes of the past twenty-five years, and more immediately for the mistakes of these first years of war.

I think we are agreed as school administrators that there are many shortages in the school program and that we have contributed to many of the mistakes of this present war effort in the lack of proper training of youth in our schools. I would be unwilling to admit that these mistakes are any more grave or of any greater consequence than the mistakes of government, business, or those in other areas of our national life. This war has taught us that the strategy of war changes and revolutionizes all of the war effort. In more or less degree the national and international lives of people will change in such corresponding phases, all of which will necessitate reorganization and continuous adaptation of the education given in the public schools to these rapid national and international changes.

However, there are fundamental things in life which are preparatory to many of these emergencies. Health and physical vigor, keen, alert, and well-trained minds motivated by worthy effort, abidingly true and faithful citizens who not only fight for their country but fight continuously for all things that are good—these are becoming more and more the first essentials in building national life.

Our schools have contributed much to these phases of training, yet there are many gaps and blind spots which need to be removed and which need the thought and planning of the best minds of our nation. This is the task that lies ahead; this is the task which, if well done, will do most to salvage the present and future civilizations. There is but one answer: America must accept the challenge of leadership. As we must win the war, so we must win the right to prepare for a more durable peace which permits people to live in the realm of love and friendship in all human relations both national and international.

A Note from Wichita Falls Public Schools

By H. D. FILLERS

Superintendent, Wichita Falls, Texas

In Wichita Falls, we are confronted with two or three war-time problems in the operation of our high school.

One of our most serious situations arises from the loss of men on our faculty. We find it quite impossible to replace the men whom we are now losing in the shop, science, and mathematics departments. In the main, we are planning to transfer women into mathematics, but we have no satisfactory solution for the vacancies in the other two fields.

Another wartime problem which is confronting us has to do with finance. We are facing a definite shortage of funds with which to maintain the present salary levels. This matter will not be so difficult in 1942 as it will be the following year.

Builders of the Southern Association

*A List of Those Who Have Served in Some Member College or
Secondary School as Many as Twenty-five Years**

EXPLANATIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

This list is continued from the issues of February and November, 1938, February, 1939, February and November, 1940; and August and November, 1941 (See pages 47-83 and 475-79, Volume II; pages 108-56, Volume III; pages 82-99 and pages 598-614, Volume IV; and pages 392-406 and 493-97, Volume V.) It includes faculty and staff members who have served as many as twenty-five years, but have not been listed in this department before. The QUARTERLY is glad to receive at any time information concerning such staff members.

This list is arranged by states in alphabetical order—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, etc.—and by institutions, colleges and secondary schools in one consolidated list, in alphabetical order—for example, Alabama College, Alabama University, Andalusia High School, Anniston High School, Bessemer High School, Birmingham, Birmingham-Southern College, etc.—with as few capitals and as many abbreviations as possible. Normally the abbreviation “h.s.” will be used to include superintendents and other supervisory officials, because their connection with the Association is through the secondary school of their system. Where, however, as in Birmingham, there are two or more secondary schools under such supervisory official, the name of the city will be used instead of the name of the high school. Furthermore, where the high school bears some local name different from that of the city, the name of the city will be used, followed by the name of the high school; for example, “Mobile, Murphy H.S.” Colleges and private schools will be found listed alphabetically by names, and followed by their address, thus: “Tulane University, New Orleans.”

Ordinary abbreviations for degrees and the institutions conferring them will be used. As between “A.M.” and “M.A.,” or “B.S.” and “S.B.,” this department will use what is reported by the individual furnishing the information, unless the editor happens to know personally that the institution reported prefers the other forms. *In cases of doubt this rule will be followed: for mediaeval or other early coinages of degree names, A.B., A.M., Ph.D., M.D., LL.D., etc.; for modern coinages B.S., M.S., M.Ed., etc.*

The symbol (2) indicates the name of employee; (3) indicates academic degrees held, with name of institutions conferring them in each case; (4) indicates institutions at which employee has pursued further studies during period of his employment; (5) indicates different positions he has held in the institution or system and length of time in each (Public high schools will include in this report their superintendent and other supervisory officials, provided of course such officials have served twenty-five years, even though part of the service of such persons was in some other

* The service of many, if not most, of these teachers and officials extends beyond the length of time their institutions have been members of the Association. Many of these persons, therefore, contributed materially in building up the standards of their schools to the point that they could win Association membership. Some names have been submitted of persons who began service with a school more than twenty-five years ago but worked elsewhere for a time and then returned to the school. The rule followed in such cases is this: if the service has been twenty-five years, exclusive of the time spent elsewhere, the name is included; otherwise the name is omitted.—ERROR.

part of the school system, e.g., an elementary principalship or teaching position; but this list does not include teachers who have spent all their time in the elementary school, and it does not include secretaries and other non-faculty employees); (6) indicates date at which service of employee began; (7) indicates present position and when entered; (8) indicates any special comment; (9) indicates initials of person furnishing information.

Request for information as to all instructors and other employees of equivalent rank who had served twenty-five years or more went forward in May to all secondary schools and colleges of the Association. It is the present purpose of the *QUARTERLY* to publish such names as a regular feature of the autumn and winter numbers each year. Whenever you have names to add to the list, refer to page 394 of the *QUARTERLY* for November, 1938, and follow the form there given. Mark the information *Form A*, give the name of your institution, followed by the symbol (1) and the name of the employee you wish to honor in this way; then number the items of information as explained above (2), (3), . . . (9); *but be sure to sign in full the name of person furnishing the information.*

ALABAMA

ALABAMA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE, AUBURN: (2) CHARLES L. ISBELL; (3) BS, MS, Ala. Poly. Inst.; PhD, Mich. St.; (3) U. Calif.; (5) in charge of research, teaching, 1917-29; prof. horticulture, 1929—; (6) 1917; (7) prof. horticulture, 1929; (9) lnd.

BIRMINGHAM, ENSLEY H.S.: (2) RUTH CHILES; (3) AB, U. Ala.; AM, Birmingham-Southern Coll.; (5) elem. sch. t., 1914-22; Eng. t., h. s., 1922—; (6) 1914; (7) Eng. t., 1922; (9) cjc.

BIRMINGHAM, ENSLEY H. S.: (2) DAISY STACEY; (3) BS, Birmingham-Southern Coll.; (4) Birmingham-Southern Coll.; (5) registrar, 1913-19; com. t., 1919-29; hd, com. dept., 1929—; (6) 1913; (7) hd, com. dept., 1929; (9) cjc.

BIRMINGHAM, PHILLIPS H. S.: (2) BESSIE H. MERRILL; (3) BS, U. Ala.; AM, Columbia U.; (5) Eng., Latin t., 1907-13; Eng. t., 1914-16, 1919-26; Eng. t., adviser to girls, 1926—; (6) 1907; (7) Eng. t., adviser to girls, 1926; (9) cjc.

BIRMINGHAM, PHILLIPS H. S.: (2) LELIA WOOD HARRIS; (3) AB, AM, U. Ala.; (4) Columbia U.; U. Ala.; (5) Latin t., 1912—; (6) 1916; (7) Latin t., 1912; (9) cjc.

BIRMINGHAM, RAMSAY H. S.: (2) LELIA E. WOOD; (3) AB, Birmingham-Southern Coll.; (5) home ec. t., Central h. s., 1913-24; Phillips h. s., 1924-26; Paul Hayne h. s., 1926-30; Ramsay h. s., 1930—; (6) 1913; (7) home ec. t., 1930; (9) cjc.

BIRMINGHAM, SHADES-CAHABA H. S.: (2) J. W. ELLENBURG; (4) U. Ala., Peabody Coll.; (5) h. s. prin., Jefferson Co., 5 yrs.; supervisor, elem.

schs., 10 yrs.; asst. supt., 8 yrs.; Latin t., Shades-Cahaba, 11 yrs.; (7) Latin t., 1931; (9) jmw.

BIRMINGHAM, WEST END H. S.: (2) N. H. PRICE; (3) AB, Birmingham-Southern Coll.; AM, Peabody Coll.; (4) U. Chicago; (5) elem. sch., 13 yrs.; supervising prin., R. E. Lee Elem. Sch., 1925—; prin., West End H. S., 12 yrs.; (6) 1917; (7) prin., 1930; (9) nhp.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, UNIVERSITY: (2) MARY GAYLE GORGAS; (5) asst. librarian, 1907—; (6) 1907; (7) asst. librarian, 1907; (9) wep.

FLORIDA

WINTER GARDEN, OAKLAND-WINTER GARDEN H. S.: (2) MRS. J. S. KIRTON; (3) BAE, U. Fla.; AM, John B. Stetson U.; (4) U. Fla.; (5) tchr., 1916-18; supervising prin., 1918-42; (6) 1916; (7) supervising prin., 1918; (9) jsk.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE: (2) HAROLD GRAY CLAYTON; (3) BSA, MSA, U. Fla.; (5) county agt., 1917-19; district agt., 1919—; AAA st. admin. officer, 1935—; (6) 1917; (7) district agt., 1919; (9) rsj.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE: (2) MARGARET LEE COBB; (4) U. Va.; U. Tenn.; (5) home demonstration agt., 1917—; (6) 1917; (7) home demonstration agt.; (9) rsj.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE: (2) EZRA FRANKLIN DEBUSK; (3) BS, Lincoln Memorial U.; (5) county agt., 1917-19, 1921-23; district 4-H club agt., 1920-21; citriculturist, 1923—; (6) 1917; (7) citriculturist, 1923;(9) rsj.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE: (2) COLUMBUS ALEX FULFORD; (5) county agt., 1914-19, 1923—; (6) 1914; (7) county agt.; (9) rsj.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE: (2) LOIS AMANDA GODBEY; (3) BS, MS, Vanderbilt U.; (5) home demonstration agt., 1915—; (6) 1915; (7) home demonstration agt.; (9) rsj.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE: (2) RUBY McDAVID; (5) county home demonstration agt., 1917-23; district home demonstration agt., 1923—; (6) 1917; (7) district home demonstration agt., 1923; (9) rsj.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE: (2) ELOISE GWYNN McGRUFF; (3) BS, MS, Fla. St. Coll. for Women; (5) county home demonstration agt., 1914—; (6) 1914; (7) county home demonstration agt.; (9) rsj.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE: (2) WILLIAM THOMAS NETTLES; (3) BS, Colo. Agric. Coll.; (5) county agt., 1917-22, 1925-27; dis-

trict agt., 1927—; (6) 1917; (7) district agt., agric. exten. service, 1927; (9) rsj.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE: JOHN JACOB SECHREST; (5) county agt., 1917-41; asst. county agt., 1941—; (6) 1917; (7) asst. county agt., 1941; (9) rsj.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE: (2) NELLIE WILSON TAYLOR; (3) diploma, West Fla. Seminary; (5) county home demonstration agt., 1916—; (6) 1916; (7) county home demonstration agt.; (9) rsj.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE: (2) GRACE F. WARREN; (3) LI, Cox Coll.; (4) Peabody Coll.; Sch. of Horticulture, Ambler, Pa.; U. Fla.; (5) county home demonstration agt., 1917—; (6) 1917; (7) county home demonstration agt.; (9) rsj.

GEORGIA

AUGUSTA, ACADEMY OF RICHMOND COUNTY: (2) S. D. COPELAND; (3) AB, LLD, Mercer U.; (4) U. Chicago; (5) academy t., 1917-20; prin., Houghton Sch., 1920-27; asst. supt., Richmond Co., 1927-34; supt., 1934—; (6) 1917; (7) supt., 1934; (8) responsible for establishment of vocational training program for both in- and out-of-school members of community; (9) sdc.

AUGUSTA, ACADEMY OF RICHMOND COUNTY AND JR. COLL. OF AUGUSTA: (2) CHARLES GUY CORDLE; (3) AB, AM, Trinity Coll. (Duke U.); AM, U. Ga.; (4) Columbia U.; U. Ga.; Emory U.; (5) Ger. t., 1916-18; Fr. t., 1920-23; hd. hist. dept. (A. R. C.), 1923—; hd. hist. dept. (J. C. A.), 1936—; (6) 1916; (7) hd. hist. dept., A. R. C., 1923; J. C. A., 1936; (8) research in local history; (9) ewh.

AUGUSTA, ACADEMY OF RICHMOND COUNTY AND JR. COLL. OF AUGUSTA: (2) W. R. KENNEDY; (3) diploma, Ga. Normal Coll., Zanerian Coll.; (4) U. Ga.; (5) hd. com. dept., A. R. C., 30 yrs.; (6) 1913; (7) hd. com. dept.; (8) development of commercial night school for employed; (9) wrk.

AUGUSTA, ACADEMY OF RICHMOND COUNTY AND JR. COLL. OF AUGUSTA: (2) CHESTER A. SCRUGGS; (3) AB, Mercer U.; AB, Columbia U.; (4) U. Chicago, Emory U.; (5) Latin, biol., chem. t.; (6) 1917; (7) hd. dept. chem., 1924; (8) building of strong chemistry department; (9) cas.

ATLANTA, GIRLS H. S.: (2) SUE E. CLAFLIN; (3) AB, U. Colo.; (4) Tchrs. Coll., Columbia U.; U. Chicago; Emory U.; (5) math. t., 31 yrs.; (6) 1912; (7) math. t., 1912; (8) organized first Girl Scout troop in Atlanta,

first Jr. A. W. V. S. in Georgia; former president of Southern Association of College Women; (9) lj.

ATLANTA, GIRLS H. S.: (2) EMMA GREGG; (3) AB, Goucher Coll.; AM, Columbia U.; (4) Oxford U., Eng.; Emory U.; Oglethorpe U.; (5) Eng., soc. sci. t., 1910-39; hd. Eng. dept., 1939—; (6) 1910; (7) hd. Eng. dept., 1939; (8) chairman of dramatic clubs; (9) lj.

ATLANTA, GIRLS H. S.: (2) MARCIA KINCAID (Mrs. J. G.); (3) AB, LaGrange; AM, Millsaps; (5) Fr., Latin t., 27 yrs.; hd. depts., 1 semester; (6) 1915; (7) Fr., Latin t., 1915; (9) lj.

ATLANTA, GIRLS H. S.: (2) CATHERINE PARKER; (3) AB, Agnes Scott Coll.; (4) Columbia U., U. Chicago, Emory U., U. Ga., Oglethorpe U.; (5) Eng., soc. sci. t.; (6) 1916; (7) Eng., soc. sci. t., 1916; (8) adviser of Girls High Times; established Quill and Scroll, international honorary society for high school journalists; (9) lj.

ATLANTA, GIRLS H. S.: (2) LIZZABEL SAXON; (3) AB, Agnes Scott Coll.; AM, Columbia U.; (4) U. Ga., Ga. St. Coll. for Women, William and Mary, U. Ga. Evening Sch.; (5) Latin, math., hist. t., 24½ yrs.; Span. t., ½ yr.; chmn. Latin dept., ½ yr.; (6) 1917; (7) chmn. Latin Dept., 1942; (9) lj.

ATLANTA, GIRLS H. S.: (2) ETHEL WOOLF; (3) AB, Smith Coll.; AB, Columbia U.; (4) Emory U., Oglethorpe U.; U. Ga. Evening Sch.; (5) Eng., Latin t., 1907-14; hist., Latin t., 1914-15; hd. hist. dept., 1915-42; (6) 1907; (7) hd., dept. soc. studies, 1915; (8) adviser of student government since 1926; aided in founding and guiding Atlanta Girls High Chapter of Cum Laude, permanent secretary; (9) lj.

EMORY UNIVERSITY, ATLANTA: (2) CHRISTIAN FREDERICK HAMFF; (3) AB, Southwestern U.; AM, U. of the South; (5) prof. mod. lang., 1917-19; asso. prof. Ger., 1919-24; prof. Ger., 1924—; (6) 1917; (7) prof. Ger., 1924; (9) jhp.

SHORTER COLLEGE, ROME: (2) CLARA LOUISE KELLOGG; (3) PhB, Baylor U.; AM, Columbia U.; (4) Columbia U., U. Penn., U. Chicago, U. Calif., U. Colo.; (5) prof. hist., 1917—; (6) 1917; (7) prof. hist., 1917; (9) lt. WAYCROSS SENIOR H. S.: (2) MYRTICE BROWN; (3) BS, Ga. St. Coll. for Women; (4) U. Ga., Ga. St. Coll. for Women; (5) hd., soc. sci. dept., 25 yrs.; (6) 1917; (7) t., dean of girls; (9) mb.

KENTUCKY

BEREA COLLEGE, BERE: (2) BENTON FIELDER; (3) BS, Berea Coll.; (4) W. Va. U., Rutgers U.; (5) supt. of garden, 1916—; instr. vocational sch., 1916-24; instr. agric., 1929—; (6) 1916; (7) supt. of garden, 1916; instr. agric., 1929; (8) extending the influence of the college to the surrounding community; (9) ag.

BEREA COLLEGE, BEREÄ: (2) EUNICE MIRIAM TRUE; (3) AB, Wisc.; BS, AM, Tchrs. Coll., Columbia U.; (4) American Academy, Rome; Columbia U.; (5) instr., 1917-18; asso. prof., 1918-24; prof., 1924—; dir. home ec. dept., 1924—; (6) 1917; (7) dir. home ec. dept., prof., 1924; (8) building of a strong department; (9) ag.

BEREA COLLEGE, BEREÄ: (2) MARY COCKS WELSH (MRS. BENJAMIN); (3) PhB, Berea Coll.; (4) U. Chicago, Columbia U.; (5) clerk, 1917-18; acting matron of boarding hall, 1918-21; supt. of boarding halls, 1921—; instr. in institution management; (6) 1917; (7) supt. of dining halls, 1921—; (9) ag.

COVINGTON, HOLMES H. S.: (2) G. R. CORNEIL; (3) BS, N. Ill. Norm. Sch.; (4) U. Cincinnati; (5) com. t., 1914—; (6) 1914; (7) com. t., 1914; (9) eh.

COVINGTON, HOLMES H. S.: (2) FRANK KARNES; (3) AB, Ohio Wesleyan U.; (4) U. Cincinnati, U. Ky.; (5) com. t., 1915-25, 1940—; asst. prin., 1925-40; (6) 1915; (7) com. t., 1940; (9) eh.

COVINGTON, HOLMES H. S.: (2) LILLIE SOUTHGATE; (4) U. Cincinnati, Cincinnati Norm. Sch.; (5) tchr., 1886—; (6) 1886; (7) tchr., 1886; (9) eh.

COVINGTON, HOLMES H. S.: (2) RUTH RILEY; (3) BS, Eastern Ky. Tchrs. Coll.; AM, Tchrs. Coll., Columbia U.; (4) U. Cincinnati, Miami U.; (5) gra. t., 1907-24; t., Hall Jr. H. S., 1926-27; t., jr. dept., Holmes H. S., 1927-34; dean of girls, jr. dept., 1934—; (6) 1907; (7) dean of girls, jr. dept., 1934; (9) eh.

COVINGTON, HOLMES H. S.: (2) MAUD ELLA WILSON; (3) AB, U. Ky.; (4) Miami U., U. Cincinnati; (5) elem., jr. h. s. t., 1908-28; t., jr. dept., Holmes H. S., 1928—; (6) 1908; (7) t., jr. dept., Holmes H. S., 1928; (9) eh.

EASTERN KENTUCKY STATE TCHRS, COLLEGE, RICHMOND: (2) BROWN E. TELFORD; (3) BS, Columbia U.; (4) Cincinnati Conservatory of Music, N. Y. Sch. of Music and Arts, New England Conservatory of Music; (5) music t., 1917—; (6) 1917; (7) music t., 1917; (9) mem.

LOUISVILLE, DUPONT MANUAL TRAINING H. S.: (2) W. L. THOMASSON; (4) U. Louisville, U. Ky., Georgetown Coll.; (5) coordinator of cooperative plan, 2 yrs.; t., 23 yrs.; (6) 1917; (7) t., 1917; (9) fjd.

LOUISIANA

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY: (2) JOHN B. FRANCIONI; (3) BS, MS, La. St. U.; (4) Iowa St. Coll.; (5) swine specialist, 1917-19; asst. prof., 1920-30; asso. prof., 1931-32; prof., 1932—; (6) 1917;

(7) prof., hd. dept. animal industry; (8) author of articles on farm meats, hogs, and pastures.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY: (2) HOMER L. GARRETT; (3) AB, La. St. U.; AM, Columbia U.; EdD, Stanford U.; (4) U. Wisc., U. Chicago; (5) asst. prin., univ. h. s., 1916-18; prin., 1918-20; prof. sec. educ., 1921—; (6) 1916; (7) prof. sec. educ., 1921.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY: (2) ELBERT L. JORDAN; (3) BS, U. Wisc.; (5) asst. prof. animal industry, 1905-10; prof., 1911-28; instr., 1938-42; (6) 1905; (7) asst. prof., 1942.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY: (2) JORDAN G. LEE, JR.; (3) BS, MS, La. St. U.; (4) U. Mo., Iowa St. Coll.; (5) in charge of research in animal industry, 1906-09; dir., prof. agric. educ., 1918-31; (6) 1906; (7) dean, coll. of agric., 1931—.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY: (2) JUSTINE MENDELSON; (3) AB, AM, La. St. U.; (4) U. Chicago, Columbia U.; (5) hd. dept. com., 1918-28; asso. prof. accounting, 1928—; (6) 1918; (7) asso. prof. accounting, 1928.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY: (2) MICHEL B. VOORHIES; (3) BS, MS, La. St. U.; MS, U. Mich.; (4) La. St. U., U. Mich.; (5) instr., 1915-20; asst. prof., 1920-23; asso. prof., 1923-31; prof., 1931-41; (6) 1915; (7) act. dean, coll. of engin., 1941—.

SOUTHWESTERN LOUISIANA INSTITUTE, LAFAYETTE: (2) RALPH HOLDEN AGATE; (3) AB, Southwestern La. Inst.; AM, La. St. U.; (4) U. Texas; (5) prof. accounting, 22 yrs.; prof. bus. admin., 4 yrs.; (6) 1906; (7) prof. bus. admin., 1938.

TULANE UNIVERSITY, NEW ORLEANS: (2) EDWARD AMBROSE BECHTEL; (3) PhD, U. Chicago; LLD, Tulane U.; (5) asst. prof., Latin, Gr., 1908-09; asso. prof., anc. lang., 1911-12; prof. classical lang., 1913-37; prof. emeritus, 1937—; dean of coll. of arts and sciences, 1918-37; dir. summer session, 1919-37; (6) 1908; (7) prof. emeritus; dean of college of arts and sciences, emeritus; 1937; (9) mth.

TULANE UNIVERSITY, NEW ORLEANS: (2) JOHN MADISON FLETCHER; (3) AB, Vanderbilt U.; AM, Colo. U.; PhD, Clark U.; (5) H. Sophie Newcomb Memorial Coll.; asst. prof. exper. and clinical psy., 1912-13; Prof., 1914-19; hd. dept. educ., 1919; act. dean, grad. dept., 1919-23; leave of absence, 1923-24; prof. educ., psy., 1923-24; Coll. of Arts and Sciences: prof. psy., 1928-38; prof. psy., emeritus, 1938-42; prof. psy., 1942—; (6) 1912; (7) prof. pys., 1942; (8) organizer of speech clinic; (9) mth.

TULANE UNIVERSITY, NEW ORLEANS: (2) JOHN SMITH KENDALL; (3) AB, AM, Tulane U.; (5) instr. Span., 1913-17; asst. prof., 1917-18;

asso. prof., 1918-29; prof., 1929-39; W. R. Irby prof. Span., 1938-39; (6) 1913; (7) prof. Span., emeritus, 1939; (9) mth.

TULANE UNIVERSITY, NEW ORLEANS: (2) JOHN McLAREN McBRYDE; (3) AB, AM, U. South Carolina; PhD, Johns Hopkins U.; LittD, U. N. C.; (5) prof. Eng., 1919-38; dean grad. sch., 1923-38; (6) 1919; (7) prof. Eng., emeritus; dean grad. sch., emeritus, 1938; (9) mth.

MISSISSIPPI

MILLSAPS COLLEGE, JACKSON: (2) ALFRED PORTER HAMILTON; (3) AB, AM, PhD, U. Penna.; (4) U. Penna.; (5) asso. prof. Gr., Ger., 3 yrs.; prof., 4 yrs.; prof. Latin, Ger., hd. dept. of anc. lang., 12 yrs.; prof. Ger., anc. lang., 5 yrs.; prof. Ger., classical lang., 1 yr.; dean of freshmen, 1931—; (6) 1917; (7) prof. Ger., classical lang., 1941; (8) helped in organizing and developing Glee Clubs; (9) glh.

MILLSAPS COLLEGE, JACKSON: (2) BENJAMIN ERNEST MITCHELL; (3) AB, Scarritt-Morrisville Coll.; AM, Vanderbilt U.; PhD, Columbia U.; (4) Columbia U.; (5) prof. math., 28 yrs.; dean, 1927-38; (6) 1914; (7) prof. math., 1914; (8) helped in organizing and developing Glee Clubs; (9) glh.

MISSISSIPPI SOUTHERN COLLEGE, HATTIESBURG: (2) WILLA BOLTON; (3) AB, Miss. St. Coll. for Women; AM, Columbia U.; (4) Clarke U.; (5) instr., asso. prof., prof. geog.; (6) 1912; (9) jbg.

NORTH CAROLINA

DAVIDSON COLLEGE, DAVIDSON: (2) WILLIAM WOODHULL WOOD; (3) AB, CE, U. Va.; (4) U. Chicago; (5) prof. math., 27 yrs.; (6) 1915; prof. math., 1915; (9) ckb.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLL. OF AGRIC. AND ENGIN., RALEIGH: (2) LEON EMORY COOK; (3) AB, BS, MS, Cornell U.; (5) asso. prof., 1917-19; prof., 1919—; (6) 1917; (7) prof. agric. educ., 1919; (9) jwh.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLL. OF AGRIC. AND ENGIN., RALEIGH: (2) JOHN BEWLEY DERIEUX; (3) BS, MS, U. Tenn.; PhD, U. Chicago; (5) instr., 1916-18; asst. prof., 1918-20; asso. prof., 1920-22; prof., 1922—; (6) 1916; (7) prof. physics, 1922; (9) jwh.

SALEM COLLEGE, WINSTON-SALEM: (2) HARRIET M. GRIEDER; (3) diploma, Salem Coll.; tchrs. certif., Am. Inst. of Applied Music, New York; (5) instr. piano; (6) 1917; (7) instr. piano, 1917; (9) bs.

SALEM COLLEGE, WINSTON-SALEM: (2) ELIZABETH O. MEINUNG; (3) BS, Salem Coll.; AM, Columbia U.; (4) Columbia U.; Woman's Coll. of U. N. C.; (5) instr. home ec.; hd. dept of home ec., 1936—; (6) 1917; (7)

prof. home ec., 1936; (8) former president of the North Carolina State Dietetic Asso.; (9) bs.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL: (2) FRANCIS FOSTER BRADSHAW; (3) AB, U. N. C.; AM, PhD, Columbia U.; (4) Columbia U.; (5) asst. in zool., 1915-16; gen. secretary, YMCA, 1916-18; dean of students, 1920—; lecturer phil., 1927-37; prof. phil., 1937—; (6) 1915; (7) dean of students, 1920; prof. phil., 1937; (9) tjw.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL: (2) STURGIS ELLENO LEAVITT; (3) AB, Bowdoin Coll.; AM, PhD, Harvard U.; (4) Harvard U.; travelling fellow in Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay; (5) asst. prof. romance lang., 1917-18; asso. prof., 1918-20; asso. prof. Span., 1920-21; prof. Span., 1921—; (6) 1917; (7) prof. Span., 1921; (9) tjw.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL: (2) ALLAN WILSON HOBBS; (3) AB, Guilford Coll.; AB, Haverford Coll.; PhD., Johns Hopkins U.; (5) instr. math., 1917-19; asst. prof., 1919-20; asso. prof., 1920-24; prof., 1924—; dean, coll. of lib. arts, 1930-35; dean, coll. of arts and sciences, 1935—; chmn. *pro tempore* of faculty, 1933; (6) 1917; (7) dean, coll. of arts and sciences, 1935; (9) tjw.

SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA H. S.: (2) MRS. KATIE MCSWEEN BRADFORD; (3) AB, La. St. Norm. Coll.; BS, in Lib. Sci., La. St. U.; (4) La. St. U.; (5) h. s. t., 20 yrs.; librarian, 5 yrs.; asst. prin., 18 yrs.; (6) 1917; (7) librarian, 1937; (9) hhb.

COLUMBIA H. S.: (2) MRS. ANNIE LEE SATTERLY TRAYLOR; (3) BS, in H. P. E., La. St. Norm. Coll.; (4) La. Poly. Inst.; (5) h. s. t., 22 yrs.; h. s. t., h. and p. e. t., 3 yrs.; (6) 1917; (7) soc. studies t., h. and p. e. t., 1939; (9) hhb.

LIMESTONE COLLEGE, GAFFNEY: (2) MONTAGUE McMILLAN; (3) AB, Limestone Coll.; AM, Geo. Washington U.; (4) Geo. Washington U., Columbia U., U. N. C., Duke U.; (6) 1917; (5) prin. prep. dept., 1917-25; asso. prof. Eng., dean of women, 1925-26; asso. prof. Eng., 1925—; (6) 1917; (7) asso. prof. Eng., 1925; (9) rcg.

LIMESTONE COLLEGE, GAFFNEY: (2) MIRIAM A. THOMPSON; (3) AB, Tulane U.; AM, U. N. C.; (4) U. Chicago, U. N. C., Duke U.; (5) prof. math and physics, 1917-27; prof. math., registrar, 1927—; (6) 1917; (7) prof. math., 1917; (9) rcg.

NEWBERRY COLLEGE, NEWBERRY: (2) S. J. DERRICK; (3) AB, Newberry Coll.; LLD, Lenoir Rhyne Coll.; (4) Columbia U., Cornell U.; (5) prep. dept., 1896-1905; asst. prof. hist., 1905-11; prof. hist., ec., 1911-18; pres., 1918-30; asso. prof. soc. sci., 1930—; (6) 1896; (7) asso. prof. soc. sci.,

1930; (8) as president secured new buildings and increased endowment; (9) jck.

NEWBERRY COLLEGE, NEWBERRY: (2) JAMES C. KINARD; (3) AB, Newberry Coll.; LLD, U. South Carolina; LittD, Erskine Coll.; (4) Columbia U.; (5) prep. dept., 1916-17; prof. math., 1917-18; hd. dept. nat. sci., 1918-30; (6) 1916; (7) pres., 1930; (9) jck.

TENNESSEE

CHRISTIAN BROTHERS COLLEGE, MEMPHIS: (2) BROTHER LUKE JOSEPH; (3) AM, Christian Brothers Coll., St. Louis, Mo.; (4) Catholic U.; (5) Eng. prof., 28 yrs.; prin., dir., 12 yrs.; (6) 1901; (7) retired as pres., 1941; (8) obtained a new campus and erected new buildings; inaugurated college courses after lapse of 25 yrs.; (9) il.

COLLIERVILLE H. S.: (2) WILLIE LYNCH; (3) Blue Mountain Coll.; (4) Peabody Coll., Memphis St. Coll.; (5) math. t., 44 yrs.; (6) 1898; (7) math. t.; (9) chh.

GIRLS PREPARATORY SCHOOL, CHATTANOOGA: (2) TOMMIE P. DUFFY; (3) PhB, U. Chicago; diplome, U. Besancon, France; (4) U. Besancon; (5) tchr., prin., 1906—; (6) 1906; (7) tchr., prin., 1906; (8) one of the founders of the school; (9) tpd.

GIRLS PREPARATORY SCHOOL, CHATTANOOGA: (2) EULA LEA JARNAGIN; (3) AB, U. Chicago; diplome, U. Besancon, France; (4) U. Besancon; (5) tchr., co-prin., 1906; (6) 1906; (7) tchr., co-prin., 1906; (8) one of the founders of the school; (9) tpd.

MARYVILLE COLLEGE, MARYVILLE: (2) WILLIAM PATTON STEVENSON; (3) AB, Westminster Coll.; BD, Western Theol. Seminary; (5) college pastor, 1917-40; college pastor emeritus, 1940—; (6) 1917; (7) college pastor emeritus, 1940; (9) rwl.

NASHVILLE, HUME-FOGG TECH. AND VOCATIONAL H. S.: (2) MRS. FLORENCE M. MOORE; (3) BSS, Bowling Green Coll. of Com.; (4) Peabody Coll.; (5) tchr.; (6) 1913; (7) tchr., 1913; (9) jhc.

SOUTHWESTERN, MEMPHIS: (2) CHARLES EDWARD DIEHL; (3) AB, Johns Hopkins U.; grad. Princeton Theol. Seminary; AM, Princeton U.; DD, Southwestern Presbyterian U.; LLD, Davidson Coll.; (5) pres., 1917—; (8) institution moved from Clarksville to Memphis and new plant built during his administration; (9) gs.

SOUTHWESTERN, MEMPHIS: (2) CHARLES LOUIS TOWNSEND; (3) AB, McGill U.; AM, PhD, Harvard U.; (4) U. Leipzig, Oxford U., U. Chicago, U. Colo., Cornell U., U. Iowa, Lehigh U., Ohio St. U., Penn. St.

Coll., U. Wisc., Northwestern U.; (5) prof. mod. lang.; (6) 1917; (7) prof. mod. lang., 1917; (9) gs.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE: (2) IRBY ROLAND HUDSON; (3) AB, AM, Vanderbilt U.; (4) Columbia U.; (5) instr. hist., 1917-20; asst. prof. hist., pol. sci., 1920—; (6) 1917; (7) asst. prof. pol. sci., 1920; (9) ab.

WARD-BELMONT SCHOOL, NASHVILLE: (2) WARREN HENRY HOLLINSHEAD; (3) PhG, DSc, Vanderbilt U.; (5) chem, t., 1916; (6) 1916; (7) chem. t., 1916; (9) rcp.

TEXAS

AGRIC. AND MECH. COLLEGE OF TEXAS, COLLEGE STATION (2) F. B. CLARK; (3) AB, AM, Richmond Coll.; PhD, Johns Hopkins U. (4) U. Chicago, Columbia U., Ohio St. U.; (5) prof., hd. dept. ec., 25 yrs. (6) 1916; (7) hd. dept., ec., 1916; (9) tcb.

AGRIC. AND MECH. COLLEGE OF TEXAS, COLLEGE STATION (2) OSCAR WILLIAM SILVEY; (3) AB, AM, Indiana U.; PhD, Chicago U. (5) hd. physics dept., 1916; (6) 1916; (7) hd. physics dept., 1916; (9) tcb.

AMARILLO SENIOR H. S.: (2) MAGGIE AVENT; (3) BS, West Texas St. Coll.; (4) Texas Tech. Coll., U. Colo., West Texas St. Coll.; (5) home ec. t., math t.; (6) 1915; (7) h. s. t., 1915; (9) cmr.

AMARILLO SENIOR H. S.: (2) MRS. GERVIS FULTON TAYLOR; (3) AB, West Texas St. Coll.; (4) Columbia U., West Texas St. Coll.; (5) elem. t. 1 yr.; jr. h. s. t., $\frac{1}{2}$ yr.; sr. h. s. t., 24 yrs.; hd. com. dept., 19 yrs.; dean of women, 20 yrs.; (6) 1916; (7) t., dean of women, 1918; (8) developed broad commercial program while head of the dept.; (9) cmr.

BEAUMONT H. S.: (2) METTIE FERGUSON; (3) AB, Southwestern U. AM, Southern Methodist U.; (4) U. Texas, U. Calif., Northwestern U. Peabody Coll., Columbia U., Southern Methodist U.; (5) Latin t., 12 yrs. registrar, 10 yrs.; Latin, Span. t., 7 yrs.; (6) 1912; (7) Latin, Span. t.; (9) ns.

ELECTRA H. S.: (2) B. M. DINSMORE; (3) AM, Southern Methodist U. (4) U. Chicago; (5) supt., 25 yrs.; (6) 1917; (7) supt., 1917; (8) every building now in use by schools built while he was supt.; (9) bmd.

ELECTRA H. S.: (2) IDA LEE FALLS; (3) BS, North Texas St. Tchrs. Coll.; (4) U. Texas, North Texas St. Tchrs. Coll., Southern Methodist U. Baylor Coll., U. Calif.; (5) elem. t., 4 yrs.; ward prin., 15 yrs.; h. s. t., 6 yrs.; (6) 1917; (7) h. s. t., 1936; (9) ilf.

GALVESTON, BALL H. S.: (2) MRS. SUE G. BATES; (3) AB, Sam Houston St. Tchrs. Coll.; (4) Columbia U., U. Calif., U. Wisc., U. Texas; (5) pri. t., 15 yrs.; h. s. t., 8 yrs.; art t., $5\frac{1}{2}$ yrs.; dean of students, Ball h. s.

24—; (6) 1893; (7) dean of students, 1924; (8) organized pupil personnel cords; instigated many extracurricular activities; (9) be.

ALVESTON, BALL H. S.: (2) J. H. HARDIE; (4) U. Texas, Sam Houston St. Tchrs. Coll.; (5) hd. com. dept., 28 yrs.; (6) 1914; (7) hd. com. dept., 1914; (8) faculty adviser of school magazine for 15 yrs.; (9) be.

ILLSBORO H. S.: (2) O. W. SCOTT; (3) AB, Baylor U.; MS, North Texas St. Tchrs. Coll.; (4) U. Texas, Greely Coll.; (5) math t., 30 yrs.; (6) 1912; (7) math t., 1912; (9) ows.

ORTH TEXAS STATE TCHRS. COLLEGE, DENTON: (2) SAMUEL ALFRED BLACKBURN; (3) BE, Ill. St. Norm. U.; AM, Austin Coll.; HD, U. Texas; (5) instr. manual tr., 1917-27; asso. prof. indus. educ., 1927-30; prof. indus. educ., 1930-35; prof., dir., indus. educ., 1935—; (6) 1917; (7) prof., dir., indus. educ., 1935; (9) kh.

ORTH TEXAS STATE TCHRS. COLLEGE, DENTON: (2) ALBERT EDNEY KEITH; (3) AB, Peoples Nat'l U.; BS, North Texas St. Tchrs. Coll.; M, Texas Christian U.; (5) prin., instr. math., Demonstration Sch.; instr. math., Demonstration Sch., 1933—; (6) 1917; (7) instr. math., 1933; (9) kh.

ORTH TEXAS STATE TCHRS. COLLEGE, DENTON: (2) LOUIS LIONEL MILLER; (3) AB, AM, U. Texas; (5) asso. prof. chem., 1917-19; dir., prof. physics, 1919—; (6) 1917; (7) dir., prof. physics, 1919; (9) kh.

AM HOUSTON STATE TCHRS. COLLEGE, HUNTSVILLE: (2) CARL HUFFOR; (3) AB, Southwestern U.; AM, U. Colo.; (4) U. Minn., U. Texas, U. Chicago, U. Colo.; (5) Eng., speech instr., 1917-23; dir., dept. pub. service, 1923-39; prof. speech, dir. dept., 1939—; (6) 1917; (7) prof. speech, dir. dept., 1939; (8) organized dept. of pub. service and honor scholarship society; (9) mr.

OUTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, GEORGETOWN: (2) JOHN CAMPBELL GODBEY; (3) AB, AM, Central Coll.; (5) prof. chem., hd. dept., 1917—; d. dept. physical sciences, 1939—; (6) 1917; (7) prof. chem., hd. dept. physical sciences; (8) pre-medical adviser, senior counselor; (9) jnrs.

TEXAS COLLEGE OF MINES AND METALLURGY, EL PASO: (2) MORT FRANKLIN JENNESS; (3) MD, Dartmouth Coll.; (4) Boston U., U. So. Calif.; (5) lecturer in first aid and pub. health, 1917-28; instr. biol. sciences, health officer, 1928-32; asst. prof. biol. sciences, health officer, 1932—; (6) 1917; (7) asst. prof., health officer, 1932; (8) Lt. Comdr., U. S. N., retired; published number of articles for medical magazines; designer of the Jenness dissecting scissors; (9) fss.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) PAUL MASON BATCHELDER; (3) AB, Dartmouth Coll.; AM, Princeton U.; PhD, Harvard U.; (5) instr.

math., 1916-17; instr. math., 1919-22; adj. prof. math., 1923, 1925-29; asso. prof., 1930—; (6) 1916; (7) asso. prof. math., 1930; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) JOE GILBERT; (3) BS, Agric. and Mech. Coll. of Texas; MD, U. Texas; (5) univ. physician for men, 1909-20; chief of health service, 1930-32; dir. health service, 1933—; (6) 1909; (7) dir. health service, 1933; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) BESS HEFLIN; (3) AB, U. Texas; AM, Columbia U.; (5) Instr. home ec., 1917-18; adj. prof., 1918-22; asso. prof., 1923-28; prof., 1929—; (6) 1917; (7) prof. home ec., 1929; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) WILLIAM DEMING HORNADAY; (5) hd. div. pub. lectures and publicity, 1917-19; dir. publicity, 1920-25; dir. publicity, lecturer in journalism, 1926-32; dir. publicity, 1933-38; journalistic research historian, 1938—; (6) 1917; (7) journalistic research historian, 1938; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) JULIUS LUTHER JINKINS; (3) MD, U. Texas; (5) instr. gynecology, 1917-26; adj. prof., 1927-36; asst. prof., obstetrics and gynecology, 1936; (6) 1917; (7) asst. prof., 1936; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) JOHN CHRISTOPHER NOLAN; (5) bookkeeper, medical branch, 1917-20; provost, 1921-22; bus. officer of medical branch, 1923—; (6) 1917; (7) business officer of medical branch, 1923; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) THEOPHILUS SHICKEL PAINTER; (3) AB, Roanoke Coll.; AM, PhD, Yale U.; (5) adj. prof. zool., 1916-22; asso. prof., 1923-24; prof., 1924—; distinguished prof. zool., 1939—; (6) 1916; (7) distinguished prof. zool., 1939; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) FLEMING ALLEN CLAY PERRIN; (3) PhB, PhD, U. Chicago; (5) adj. prof. psych., 1917-22; asso. prof., 1923-24; prof., 1925—; (6) 1917; (7) prof. psych., 1925; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) BENJAMIN FLOYD PITTENGER; (3) BPd, AB, Mich. St. Norm. Coll.; AM, U. Texas; PhD, U. Chicago; (5) adj. prof. educ'l admin., 1916-19; asso. prof., 1920-24; act. dean sch. educ., 1923; prof., 1925; prof., dean of sch. of educ., 1926—; (6) 1916; (7) prof., dean sch. educ., 1926; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) WILLIAM BOYD READING; (3) MD, U. Texas; (5) instr. clinical medicine, 1915-18; adj. prof. diseases of children, 1919-22; asso. prof., 1923-26; prof., 1927-34; prof. pediatrics, 1935—; medical dir. st. hospital for crippled and deformed children, 1939-40; (6) 1915; (7) prof. pediatrics, 1935; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) HENRY REID ROBINSON; (3) PhG, MD, U. Texas; (5) instr. obstetrics and gynecology, 1917-24; adj.

prof., 1925-26; asso. prof., 1927-32; prof., 1933-36; prof. clinical obstetrics and gynecology, 1936; (6) 1917; (7) prof., 1936; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) ELMER RICHARD SIMS; (3) AB, Austin Coll.; AM, U. Texas; PhD, U. Chicago; (4) U. Chicago; (5) instr. romance lang., 1916-18; adj. prof., 1919-21; asso. prof., 1923-24; prof., 1925—; (6) 1916; (7) prof. romance lang., 1925; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) IONE PETTEY SPEARS; (3) AB, AM, U. Texas; (5) law librarian, 1916-22; student life secretary, 1923-30; instr. hist., 1934—; (6) 1916; (7) instr. hist., 1934; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) MRS. CHARLES STEPHENSON; (3) BLit, U. Texas; (5) cataloguer, 1914-18; asst. in library, 1919-23; supervisor of accessions, 1924; supervisor of accessions and bookkeeper, 1925-29; accessions librarian and bookkeeper in library, 1930—; (6) 1914; (7) accessions librarian, bookkeeper, 1930; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) CHARLES TURNER STONE; (3) AB, Southwestern U.; MD, U. Texas; (5) registrar, John Sealy Hospital, 1915-17; adj. prof. medicine, registrar, 1918-21; adj. prof. clinical medicine, 1922-25; prof. practice of medicine, 1926-40; prof. internal medicine, 1941—; (6) 1915; (7) prof. internal medicine, 1941; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) KATHERINE ERNESTINE WHEATLEY; (3) AB, AM, U. Texas; PhD, U. Chicago; (4) U. Chicago; (5) tutor in Fr., 1917-18; instr., 1919-23; adj. prof. romance lang., 1924-36; asso. prof., 1936—; (6) 1917; (7) asso. prof. romance lang., 1936; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) BERRY McCLURE WHITAKER; (3) AB, Indiana U.; (5) instr. physical tr. for men, 1916-29; dir. intramural athletics for men, 1930—; (6) 1917; (7) dir. intramural athletics for men, 1930; (9) lch.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN: (2) ERNEST WILLIAM WINKLER; (3) BLit, AM, U. Texas; (5) reference librarian, curator of Texas books, 1915-22; librarian, 1923-34; bibliographer, 1924—; (6); 1915; (7) bibliographer, 1934; (9) lch.

VIRGINIA

BEDFORD H. S.: (2) J. L. BORDEN; (3) AB, AM, Roanoke Coll.; (4) Columbia U.; (5) prin., 1917—; (6) 1917; (7) prin., 1917; (9) jlb.

PETERSBURG H. S.: (2) ANN McILWAINE Cooper; (4) Columbia U., U. Va., U. Tenn., Coll. of William and Mary, U. Richmond; (5) gra. sch. t., 1901-07; h. s. t., 1907—; (6) 1910; (7) h. s. t., 1907; (9) hdw.

PETERSBURG H. S.: (2) HOWARD FREAS; (3) AB, Penn. Coll.; (4) U.

Besancon, U. Dijon, Sorbonne, Johns Hopkins U.; (5) hd. mod. lang. dept., Fr., Ger. t.; (6) 1916; (7) hd. mod. lang. dept., 1916; (9) hdw.

PETERSBURG H. S.: (2) NETTIE H. LEFTWICH; (4) Columbia U., Coll. of William and Mary, U. Va.; (5) com. t., 29 yrs.; (6) 1912; (7) com. t., 1912; (9) hdw.

PETERSBURG H. S.: (2) H. AUGUSTUS MILLER, JR.; (3) AB, AM, U. Dela.; (4) Johns Hopkins U.; (5) hd. Eng. dept., 27 yrs.; asst. prin., 14 yrs.; (6) 1914; (7) hd. Eng. dept., 1914; asst. prin., 1927; (8) author and editor; (9) hdw.

PETERSBURG H. S.: (2) HERBERT DEGRANGE WOLFF; (3) AB, AM, U. Va.; (4) Columbia U.; (5) hd. math. dept., 4 yrs.; prin. h. s., 28 yrs.; (6) 1909; (7) prin., 1913; (9) hdw.

SULLINS COLLEGE, BRISTOL: (2) EDITH SUMTER BLACKWELL; (3) AB, Randolph-Macon Coll. for women; (4) American Academy, Rome; (5) art appreciation, Bible t.; (6) 1917; (7) art appreciation, Bible t., 1917; (9) dlm.

WYTHEVILLE H. S.: (2) R. P. THOMAS; (3) AB, Roanoke Coll.; (4) Radford Coll.; (5) tchr., 29 yrs.; (6) 1911; (7) math., sci. t., 1911; (9) fed.

The A.B. Degree for Two Years' Work: An Open Forum

In response to the open forum announced in the May QUARTERLY on pages 335-336, the following persons connected with member schools and colleges have made contributions:

Dean S. L. Akers, Wesleyan College
Dean Kyle T. Alfried, Georgia Military College
Professor Dice R. Anderson, Mary Washington College
Dean C. K. Brown, Davidson College
President Leslie H. Campbell, Campbell College
Dean I. N. Carr, Mars Hill College
Dean C. B. Collier, State Teachers College, Florence, Ala.
Dean C. C. Colvert, Northeast Junior College
Dean J. E. Conner, Texas College of Arts and Industries
Dean Benson W. Davis, Meredith College
Dean J. Thomas Davis, John Tarleton Agricultural College
President H. L. Donovan, University of Kentucky
Executive Secretary R. B. Draughon, Alabama Polytechnic Institute
President Samuel P. Duke, Madison College
President W. H. Elkins, San Angelo College
President Paul L. Garrett, Western Kentucky State Teachers College
President C. Sylvester Green, Coker College
Dean H. L. Griffin, Southwestern Louisiana Institute
Dean Wyatt W. Hale, Birmingham-Southern College
Dean Colby D. Hall, Texas Christian University
President Eric W. Hardy, Junior College of Augusta
President A. F. Harman, Alabama College
Dean James H. Hewlett, Centre College of Kentucky
Associate Director H. A. Hodges, Edinburg Junior College
Dean K. J. Hoke, College of William and Mary
President Z. T. Johnson, Asbury College
Dean E. N. Jones, Baylor University
Professor Edgar W. Knight, University of North Carolina
President W. J. McConnell, North Texas State Teachers College
Dean E. J. Mathews, University of Texas
President A. L. May, Harrison-Stone-Jackson Agricultural High School and Junior College
President Leon R. Meadows, East Carolina Teachers College

President R. B. Montgomery, Lynchburg College
Mother M. Angelique, Dean, Our Lady of the Lake College
President W. L. Murfee, Marion Institute
President H. G. Noffsinger, Virginia Inter mont College
Dean J. J. Oppenheimer, University of Louisville
President A. A. Page, Pikeville College
Dean Raymond B. Pinchbeck, Richmond College
Dean J. H. Purks, Emory University
President M. E. Sadler, Texas Christian University
Registrar E. L. Setzler, Lenoir Rhyne College
Sister Charles Mary, Registrar, Nazareth College
Dean Austin W. Smith, Tennessee Polytechnic Institute
Dean Marten ten Hoor, Tulane University
President J. C. Thompson, Southern Junior College
Dean Oscar A. Ullrich, Southwestern University
President William H. Vaughan, Morehead State Teachers College
Dean H. M. Weathersby, Louisiana College
Dean E. V. White, Texas State College for Women
President Sam H. Whitley, East Texas State Teachers College
Dean C. R. Wood, State Teachers College
Professor Gladstone H. Yeuell, University of Alabama

Dean Akers makes the following comments:

"A little girl once asked her father, 'If I go upstairs can God make it that I didn't go upstairs?' Changing the language but retaining the contradiction we might ask, 'If I don't earn an A.B. degree can an educational institution make it that I do earn an A.B. degree?' Through a period of years the educational world has stipulated collectively and with some measure of unanimity the meaning of the A.B. degree. Shall we now say in effect that going half-way up the stairs is equivalent to going all the way up the stairs?

"The problem at the outset is one of ambiguity, confusion, and contradiction. Grant with William James that truth happens to an idea and that ideas are true only so long as they work. Then it follows that by practice we may read out of the A.B. degree its present meaning and read into it a new connotation. But the fact remains that A.B. degree "one" represents a total of individual life experience acquired in four years, while A.B. degree "two" represents such experience over a period of two years. We may assert the right of freedom in the stipulation of meaning, but in so doing we submit to the magic of the name. Let's be honest about it. If we think a two-year period is long enough for boys and girls to remain in college, let's present the arguments, prescribe the curriculum, and then use our ingenuity

to devise an appropriate award to confer upon the graduates. In so doing we shall avoid ambiguity and the suspicion of being disingenuous.

"The writer does not hold the opinion that a two-year period is sufficient time for boys and girls to achieve individually and personally the values latent in a college experience. He has seen too many of his students half-way up the stairs at the end of the second year—too many of them, who at the end of four years have become poised, mature and competent. William Allan Neilson's description of the American four-year college as 'a place to grow up in' represents an idea which is pragmatically verified in human lives from north to south and from east to west.

"The present emergency, which for many is the occasion for shortening the period of formal education, constitutes, together with its probable consequent events, one of the most potent arguments for the preservation of the four-year, liberal-arts college. Never before in the world's history has human ingenuity devised so many or so mighty instruments of destruction. We cannot say now what the post-war world will be, but we do know that civilization must be rebuilt materially, socially, nationally, internationally, morally, and spiritually. The speed, which, it seems, will win the war, may be the factor which will lose the peace. A generation deprived of 'a place to grow up in' may lack the wisdom, born of deliberate contemplation, which alone can build a better world. The future may suffer the consequences of such deprivation, or, if we are wise, it may find truth 'happening' to the moral, spiritual, and intellectual ideas of the four-year liberal-arts college."

Dean Alfrend agrees:

"It does not seem to me to be wise or expedient that we should allow the demands of war to destroy the standards that time has established as best for the education of the youth of our land. Wars of the past have brought too much injury to the principles of morality and justice to the world. They have caused too much a break with that which is best for right living to allow this great conflict to overthrow completely the plans which educated men and women have found best for the successful training of our youth. No one doubts or denies that the colleges and universities must readjust their programs to better aid our nation in this conflict. Our boys and girls must be given better training to equip them to help win this fight for freedom and democracy. But surely this demand for better trained citizens does not demand that we send our youth into life half equipped. It seems to me to be as unwise as sending battleships into battle with no airplane support.

"For many years I have thought our school year should be lengthened. I see no good reason for thinking that 180 days are enough for a school year. The long summer vacations do more harm than good. Our educational program could easily run 44 weeks. Both public school and college

would profit by it. In our new program we must think of the whole man. We need to stress the development of strong moral men and women. We must give them better bodies. Our physical education program must include all students, not the few athletes. Our students must be taught their full social obligations. Racial prejudices must be eliminated. Every boy and girl in our schools and colleges should have a vocational training fully equal to the demands of the times. Then they would go into life trained to be better citizens, more useful to their country and fighting to make our nation a greater haven for freedom and democracy. This cannot be done with a shortened course. The need for men and women morally strong, mentally alert, and physically awake demands the full time of our best institutions."

Professor Anderson writes:

"I am very earnestly opposed to giving the A.B. degree for two years' college work. Although there are different requirements for that degree now and the quality of the degree given by different institutions is certainly far from uniform, nevertheless the A.B. degree means that a student has completed with success the equivalent of four years of college work beyond graduation from high school. If some institutions give the degree after two years' work, there will be confusion in the minds of the public as to what the degree really means. It would seem also to me to be a further step in the breakdown of liberal education, which is certainly having a hard enough time already, and which has made and can make such an important contribution to our civilization. I am extremely sorry to see the A.B. degree tampered with."

Dean Brown continues in similar vein:

"It must be remembered that the four-year American college is part of a general system of education, more or less indigenous, and that it rests squarely upon a secondary school system that is not designed to turn out students capable of completing a broad liberal education in two years. It does not, except in very rare cases, do so.

"Undoubtedly it is possible to find a limited number of secondary school graduates who have achieved such mastery of the tools of learning and such intellectual maturity as to enable them to acquire in two years of college a more thorough liberal education than the bulk of American college students acquire in four years. A good case can doubtless be made for allowing these students to receive Bachelor's degrees at the end of two years, just as a small number at the other end of the scale are granted degrees after five years, say, of work, although it might be insisted that they would be still better educated after four years. Since no one has ever contended that all Bachelors of Art are equally well educated, there would seem to be no great reason for depriving the more capable students of the advantages of a four-year

course merely to keep them on an equality with their less gifted brethren. In this connection the argument that the last two years of college are largely wasted in a specialization for which the university is better equipped than the college is somewhat less than convincing, since the object of the college major is not specialization in the university sense, but the mere introduction of the principle of vertical sequence or progression, in which there is nothing inimical to liberality of education.

"Any proposal to award the Bachelor's degree to run-of-the-mine secondary school graduates after two years of college should be expected to cheapen the degree to the sophomore level, unless it can be supposed that the proponents of such a change have hit upon some plan for enormously hastening the process of intellectual and emotional maturity (not to mention development of moral judgment, currently much belittled), while at the same time supplying almost incredible deficiencies in the elementary tools of learning. It may humbly be suggested that freshman courses bearing sweeping or even poetic titles and purporting to survey all that man has learned about himself and his universe scarcely constitute such a plan."

President Campbell summarizes:

"I am unalterably opposed to awarding the A.B. degree at the end of two years of college work. In the mind of the American public this degree is definitely associated with a four-year program with certain specialization impossible in a two-year college. To change the requirements will not add any dignity to the college offering it, nor confer any special wisdom upon the recipient. At the same time, it is inclined to cheapen standards."

Dean Carr writes:

"I cannot see any wisdom in granting the A.B. degree at the end of a junior college course. That degree so generally has marked the end of a four-year college course that I believe higher education would sustain a definite loss if such a proposal were adopted.

"May I venture the further assertion that the tendency would be to force small liberal arts colleges to become junior colleges. Such a program would definitely favor only the larger institutions. While I am working in a junior college where seventy-five per cent of our graduates transfer to senior colleges and universities, I feel that our cultural life would be much poorer if our small four-year colleges were injured. Society would lose much if all college graduates came from the large public and private universities. While these have their very useful place, I believe all are needed.

"I feel that the Atlanta resolutions were very timely. I do not believe that present education is all wrong. During this emergency we have to emphasize certain courses and advise students in the light of the present day demands. But by doing this we do not assume that our programs are bad and

all wrong. We must be ready to make changes, drop subjects, add new ones. Colleges *must teach* students in order that they may more efficiently serve society. Whether a degree is awarded either at the end of two years or four years does not mean that the student will know more or less. It seems to me that we should be making an effort to obtain quality.

"In the event that a degree should be awarded the junior college graduates, I feel that it should be a degree peculiar to the junior college, and one that has not been generally used by senior institutions."

Dean Collier expresses his opinion:

"Our educational system extends from the elementary school through the university. It is not an accidental arrangement, but a planned development by the best thinkers in our educational history.

"In this system the A.B. degree holds an important place as indicating four years of development by the students on the college level. The nature of this growth has changed from time to time according to educational philosophy and in adjusting to changes in society, but the extent of the period has remained fairly constant.

"Two conclusions seem to be justified regarding the use of the A.B. First, one unit of the system cannot be cut in half without great consequences to the entire system. If the educational ladder is now antiquated, let it be studied as a system with a view to adjusting the parts that make up the system. Second, if the completion of the first two years of college work needs to be recognized by a degree, let it be a new designation and not the A.B.

"If graduation upon the completion of two years of work has merit, it will give proper prestige to its own degree. It does not belong in the clast with the A.B. nor should it borrow the A.B. to give it recognition.

"The making of changes sometimes indicates instability rather than progress."

Dean Colvert favors the two-year degree ultimately but probably not now:

"I am not ready to say that we of the junior colleges should immediately start awarding the Bachelor's degree. I do feel that within a short space of a very few years the junior colleges will and should award the Bachelor's degree. We are in the age of general and vocational education for the first two years of college training. Professional training will follow the general education training, and a job in commerce and industry will follow the two-year vocational training. Hence the necessity for offering the Bachelor's degree at the end of the junior college training. Such a procedure will place higher education on a definite basis of service to all our youth."

Dean Conner is willing to have a two-year degree but sees no need of confusing the issue by trying to use the A.B.:

"It certainly is not possible for the average junior college student to do in two years the quantity and quality of work incorporated in the program of the traditional A.B. degree. To confer the degree upon the lower level would have the same effect upon the standard degree as the debasement of the coinage by similar expedients. If the A.B. degree is restricted to two years of work, then the A.M. degree would have to come down to it, or an intermediate degree would probably become necessary. At least, this seems to be true if there is to be any assurance that the student will be properly equipped for graduate study. It is generally believed that many of those who hold the A.B. are but meagerly prepared, either in subject matter or in maturity, to do really effective advanced work. To accept less training would be disastrous.

"For these reasons, the A.B. degree should not be given to junior college graduates. There cannot, however, be much doubt that some kind of degree should be arranged for those who finish the two-year course, because for a large number of them this graduation ends the period of formal education. But let's have the terminology mill grind and produce for us a suitable title. The mill should be able to grind without upsetting the entire system of terms and values now in satisfactory use."

Dean B. W. Davis writes vigorously:

"I am most definitely and unalterably opposed to giving the A.B. degree for two years' work, and to giving the A.B. as a junior college degree. In my opinion, the attempt to reduce the A.B. course to two years will result in confusion confounded by making a bad situation desperate. The notable increase in technical and scientific studies has been given accelerated impetus by the war; hence we can expect a still greater decrease in the study of the liberal arts, more particularly of the ancient languages and philosophy. When we are facing such a prospect, it is worse than folly to contemplate the awarding of the cultural liberal arts degree for two years' work. If there is need for a degree to signify the end of two years of work, why not call it an 'H.D.'?—meaning *Half Done!*"

Dean J. T. Davis deplors the emphasis upon a "degree":

"My feeling is that there is entirely too much hullabaloo about the whole matter. I cannot see that it makes very much difference whether we call the graduation certificate a 'diploma,' a 'degree,' or an 'associate degree.' It has been our custom here for twenty-three years to issue a diploma which is recognized and known as an 'Associate in Arts' or an 'Associate in Sciences' as the case may be. I think we shall continue to issue our diploma as such.

"When a junior college graduate transfers to a senior college, the diploma

is not presented anyway. It means nothing to the senior college and is only a memento for the graduate and his family. The senior college is necessarily concerned about the credits transferred and the rating of the credits rather than with the diploma recognizing graduation. In fact, the John Tarleton Agricultural College does not encourage its seniors who have completed most of the work for graduation to return here for completion of their work. To encourage such students to return for graduation seems to us to be a selfish motive on the part of the institution and not to the best interests of the student. If a student is lacking only a few hours in graduating from the junior college, it seems to us that his interests would be better served if we gave him his transcript of credits and permitted him to proceed to a senior college where he could expend all of his energies and time in the advancement of his education and degree. We are not very much concerned about whether this certificate of graduation is called a 'diploma,' a 'degree,' or a 'what-have-you'."

President Donovan writes:

"I do not favor giving the A.B. degree as a junior college degree. I think that the A.A. degree is a much more appropriate degree to award graduates of the junior college. I am very definitely of the opinion that universities should have a terminal course two years in length. This curriculum should provide for general education. Those students who desire to go on with their education, specializing in the different fields of learning, or who desire to enter professional schools, should be selected with care after they have completed two years of general education. About half the students in our universities drop out before the end of two years, and many of them have a feeling of failure or frustration as a result of this experience. A curriculum two years in length that would enable them to graduate at the end of the sophomore year would send many of them back to their homes with an entirely different attitude toward their college work. I believe universities are neglecting this great mass of students. It is my hope that we shall recognize this problem before long and attempt to do something about it."

Secretary Draughon comments somewhat facetiously:

"(1) Since the A.B. degree has traditionally represented four years of work on college level, it would seem to me to be unwise and unwarranted to grant the same degree for two years of work. Undoubtedly much confusion would result.

"(2) Since, however, the work of the General College of the University of Chicago is admittedly excellent and deserving, certainly, of some award and since the customary award for the completion of a college course is some kind of a degree, it appears altogether feasible to me that the University should award a degree, but not the A.B. degree.

"(3) That raises the question as to what this two-year degree should be called. If I understood the sentiments of those present at the February meeting of the Southern Association, I believe that Doctor Hutchins might very well receive the accord of the Southern Association if, instead of styling his two-year degree 'Bachelor's' degree, he would style it the 'Son of a Bachelor's' degree."

President Duke suggests:

"I am heartily opposed to granting the A.B. degree for any amount of work less than that represented by the present four-year program. I think we would make a great mistake to alter our educational requirements for the Bachelor's degree on account of the present national emergency. Very likely, after the war, we may want to add requirements to those already in effect."

President Elkins writes:

"I am not in favor of giving the A.B. degree as a junior college degree, as I think that this would lead to confusion without having any particular significance. There may be a need for another degree for two years of college work—a degree which might be given universal recognition such as Associate in Arts. I do think that too much importance has been attached to the A.B. degree and that something should be done to recognize college work below that level."

President Garrett comments:

"However much or little the Bachelor's degree may have stood for during the various stages of the evolution of the American institutions of higher education, it has come to be recognized everywhere as representing four years' work. I am definitely opposed to the confusion which will result from the conferring of the A.B. degree for the completion of two years' work. Neither do I think that two years are sufficient time in which to secure the broad general education as a foundation for professional training. Indeed, I wish that all students who have the intelligence and taste to profit by it might have the benefits to be derived from four years' general training. I am therefore opposed to any plan which presents to such students a temptation to be satisfied with less."

President Green suggests difficulties of evaluation:

"My first reaction is one of definite and reasoned opposition to the idea of conferring the Bachelor of Arts degree at the end of two years of college work. This opposition might be modified some if it were understood that this would be done only in instances of exceptionally brilliant students whose store of knowledge might be graded as equal to the average student now

completing the full four years. But my opposition centers mainly in these considerations: the value of such degrees already conferred, the resulting difficulty of proper appraisal of the new degrees for those doing advanced work, and the general uncertainty in my own mind that the idea has merit at all."

Dean Griffin argues tolerantly in favor of the Chicago proposals but does not desire the Chicago example to be followed by colleges in general:

"The plan of the University of Chicago to grant the Bachelor's degree at the end of approximately two years of study does not cause me to become worried or excited. Knowing the University of Chicago and some of the men who voted for the making of this change, I have every reason to believe that they acted in good faith and can give good and sufficient reasons for their actions. It should be pointed out that the Chicago plan involves not necessarily the mere completion of two years of college work, but rather the satisfactory mastery of a certain quantity of work in accordance with carefully prepared syllabi and, also, the passing of certain comprehensive examinations. Under certain conditions, this achievement might be attained in less than two years by some, or it might require more than two years or even four years by others. My understanding of the proposal is that the plan is one that Chicago has worked out for itself and is not necessarily urging other colleges and universities to adopt.

"In discussing the plan with representatives of the University of Chicago faculty, I was interested in some of the reasons that prompted them to put the new plan into operation. Among them, I found the following. First, Chicago admits a rather highly selected group of students, students whose ability and seriousness of purpose are well established. In the second place, from the very beginning, Chicago has favored, in theory, the organization of education on the basis of the six-four-four plan. The granting of the degree in this manner is, therefore, the logical culmination of an historical idea. This plan, as we know, follows the scheme of education in several European countries.

"Another reason that was taken into consideration was that it is desirable to complete the general education of the student before he enters upon his professional or specialized training or returns to take his place in society. Under this schedule, many young men and women would be enabled to enter upon their life's work at an earlier age, which is regarded as socially desirable. Finally, the Chicago faculty is apparently convinced that the extent and thoroughness of the general education received by the student under this program will compare favorably in quantity and in quality with that required for the Bachelor of Arts degree by many present day colleges, as well as by older colleges in the earlier period, say around 1840. If this is true, the granting of the degree on the completion of the Chicago plan

would surely do no violence to the traditional Bachelor's degree as granted by European universities, by the early colleges of America, and by some colleges of the present day,

"In conclusion, therefore, I should say that, for the University of Chicago, the plan has many good features that are logical and commendable. This is not saying that the plan would be suitable for every college or university. In fact, I would not want to see colleges and universities, in general, undertake to imitate the Chicago plan unless they have resources, organization, and leadership comparable to those of the University. It would be particularly harmful and ill-advised for lower divisions and junior colleges to launch a program for granting degrees on the completion of their two-year curricula. These units function now mainly as agencies of transition from high school to college and are not as well-developed collegiate institutions as the Chicago college seems to be. Most of them still operate on the old credit-counting basis rather than on achievement verified by comprehensive examinations. For these reasons, I would offer no serious objections to the Chicago attempt to accomplish an age-long task in a different and more challenging way."

Dean Hale comments:

"In my opinion, the arguments advanced by President Hutchins and others for the granting of a degree upon completion of the period of training generally recognized as 'general education' are thoroughly sound. I can see absolutely no excuse, however, for introducing the interminable confusion which would result from conferring the Bachelor's degree to symbolize the attainment of that step in the educational process. As Walter C. Eells, probably the most careful student of the junior college, has so well pointed out: 'The baccalaureate degree, marking graduation from a standard four-year college or university, has become so fixed in American educational life that it is probably unwise to attempt to change it.' Since it was first conferred at the University of Chicago in 1900, the Associate in Arts title or degree has been recognized and used to mark the completion of 'junior college' or of 'general education.' If the Bachelor's degree should be awarded upon completion of 'junior college' or 'general education,' both the Associate in Arts and the Bachelor of Arts would lose their distinctive meanings and needless confusion would be the result. I am unalterably opposed to the granting of the Bachelor's degree to signify the equivalent of junior college graduation."

Dean Hall writes crisply:

"The proposal to grant the A.B. for two years of college work, then require three for the Master's, is sound only on the Master's end of it. That needs reform.

"But to crown a two-year curriculum with an A.B. strikes me as a species of plagiarism.

"If the new pattern is sound, let it prove itself, find its own name, and not filch one which is already fraught with another meaning.

"Pioneering? Then let the pioneering be genuine, no pseudo.

"New wine is it? Then get you a new goat-skin, lest you both burst the old skin and spill your wine.

"Any institution that vaunts itself as big enough to swing such a change should be strong enough to put over a new title. Be clear. Be honest."

President Hardy continues:

"(1) I have no sympathy with any proposal to lower the traditional content of the A.B. degree. The A.B. degree is not the particular property of any individual or institution, or small group of individuals or institutions. I think it would be a tragedy for higher education in America if any considerable body of educators were to yield to any such suggestion. (2) This seems to me to be just one more indication of a general tendency in some quarters to dilute education in the name of defense effort, through the lowering of entrance requirements, the introduction into the curricula of so-called 'survey courses,' and too much 'acceleration' in the foundational years.

"There are grave dangers in all these suggestions against which we need to be constantly on guard. It is certainly not unpatriotic to be unwilling to sacrifice to hysterical clamor the educational gains of the last forty years. On the contrary, it would be a tragedy to surrender them. The post-war world, with all its tremendous problems of reconstruction, will demand something better than superficial education. Sham and pretense will not be able to serve that world."

President Harman states the point of view of his own institution but pleads for tolerance:

"Alabama College is definitely committed to the long standing standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, including the resolutions on pages 243-244 of the February issue, 1942, of the SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY. It follows that this institution does not have in contemplation at this time, or at any early time, any revision of its program of instruction or its degree requirements whereby a student would receive the A.B. degree for two years' work. The foregoing statement represents the administrative point of view for this College.

"It is my personal judgment that consideration must be given to the quantitative as well as to the qualitative aspects of higher education. We will all agree, I am sure, that it is difficult, even impossible, to place too much emphasis upon the qualitative aspects of higher education. However, this

emphasis conceivably can result disastrously if thereby students in large numbers are denied the privilege of higher education above what is now the sophomore year. If we are seriously committed to a sound democratic philosophy with respect to education as well as with respect to government in its other aspects, then we can well raise the serious question as to the consequences to the masses, if even 'general education' is to be made available only to limited numbers of men and women as compared with the traditional provisions. The democratic way is the way of opportunity. Even in the case of higher education, this should be the way for the masses, whatever modifications may be necessary to accomplish higher education for them to a more satisfactory degree.

"It is my further judgment that the bold effort of a great institution to pioneer in directions contrary to those implied above should not be taboo on account of its pioneering. The tolerance, the democracy, and the academic freedom of which we hear so much in educational councils should manifest themselves towards administrative authorities of institutions who find themselves dissatisfied with or out of line with the common practice. Moreover, those who are responsible for higher education should recognize the inevitability of change in all fields of human endeavor. Certainly we are now in great danger of falling into educational chaos. Perhaps we can avoid total disaster by keeping open minds and by maintaining a spirit of readiness to meet changing conditions as we must face them."

Dean Hewlett adds:

"Though I am an alumnus of the University of Chicago, I feel that the University should not use the A.B. degree to indicate graduation from its junior college. I understand that President Hutchins has said that he would be willing to put his graduates up against the graduates of any regular four-year college on any examination that would be an adequate test of the training such graduates had received. If this report be true, it would seem to have been much the better plan to have offered some other award to the graduate of the junior college at Chicago and then prove by actual tests satisfactory to educators that the graduate of the College of the University of Chicago is equal to the graduate of any representative regular senior college both in knowledge and development rather than simply assume this equality. It may be that young people do spend too much time in high school, and that two years can be saved and added to the college, thus enabling a student to go through the public school and college in fourteen years instead of sixteen years, the requirement at the present time. But that the saving can be made is for the present only an assumption, and Chicago should therefore not give the A.B. degree in its college until it has the proof that its students are worthy of it. If the University would make the change as an experiment and not use the A.B. degree unless or until the experiment

warranted its use, we should then have a true case of educational experimentation; and I should favor it."

Director Hodges casts his comments in the form of answers to certain of the questions formulated in the May *QUARTERLY*—

(What will be the probable effects of the proposed change if only one or two universities adopt it?)

"I do not see that there is likely to be much change if only one or two colleges adopt the two-year plan. It is true that very strong schools may, by example, later induce other colleges to adopt the same plan."

(Has the four-year college outlived its place in American education?)

"I think not under the present organization."

(Should the typical American four-year college, with its extracurricular activities and provisions for residence on the campus, be abandoned in favor of a system of predominantly local junior colleges, supplemented by a system of advanced professional and graduate schools with little or no campus life; that is, with as nearly as possible a complete emphasis upon professional and intellectual attainment?)

"This arrangement has much to recommend it where students are unable to afford the cost of attending a four-year college located at some distance from their homes. A junior college with a tuition cost that is within the reach of all who desire to attend college; which can operate a transportation system that will permit its students to live at home and attend college; and that arranges an active program of student activities so that students have an opportunity for full participation fills a very definite need, particularly where the area is located at some distance from any other type of college. At present, many students who are capable of profiting from college work are restrained, because of economic reasons, from ever attending college. Four-year colleges would have much to offer such a student if the student could afford to attend the four-year college."

(Are two years of college work sufficient for the general student who does not expect to enter a profession?)

"I cannot say that either two or four years of general college work is sufficient for the general student who does not plan to enter a profession. Some students take four years of work without getting much of a general cultural foundation. Undoubtedly there are students who do have a better general background, from their college experiences, at the end of two years than some who have had four or more years."

(Should we reduce the period of elementary-secondary education to ten years, then add a four-year college, and then place professional and graduate schools on top of that, instead of having a twelve-year elementary-secondary school, etc.?)

"Speaking entirely from my observation, I think we could very profitably lower the period of elementary-secondary education to ten years, then add a four-year college and, finally, the graduate or professional school above

that. This would presume that the four-year college would be available to all high school graduates who could profit from college work. In other words, a truly public system of education through the first fourteen years of school work for all students."

(Has the South made a mistake—in view of the present suggestions as to counting the last two years of high school as the first two of college—in accelerating the development from an eleven-year system of elementary and secondary education to a twelve-year system?)

"Since this state has just adopted the twelve-year system, it may be that my opinion is biased on this point. I think, however, that we could have done much better if we had decreased our eleven years of elementary-secondary school work to ten years and had then added, at least, two years of college work at the top. If it could be done, there should be four years of college work."

Dean Hoke states:

"I do not believe in giving the A.B. degree as a junior college degree. This degree represents an accomplishment which a two-year course for a degree cannot obtain, nor would it be equalized in my judgment by two additional years from the last two years of the high school. I think two years of college work beyond the secondary school are needed by an increasing number of people for which some recognition in the form of a certificate or a degree should be given, but this condition does not warrant the A.B. degree, which has always stood, and I hope will continue to stand, for something different, and also something which is desirable and very precious in our system of higher education."

President Johnson asserts positively:

"It is my opinion that the idea of offering an A.B. degree or any kind of Bachelor's degree for two years of college work would be harmful to a student and detrimental to the best interests of higher education. The Bachelor of Arts degree has reached a point of standardization which gives it definite meaning. Any attempt to break down these standards which have given universal recognition to the A.B. degree will destroy the very thing that leaders of higher education have been attempting throughout the years.

"I can see no objection to giving a certificate of some kind at the end of two years of college work, which would indicate that the student has done that much work toward an A.B. degree. But to give that certificate with any kind of title that might be termed a degree, Bachelor or otherwise, would seem to me to be educational mockery."

Dean Jones also takes a positive stand:

"I wish to go on record very definitely as opposed to the idea. While I favor generally innovations and progress by forgetting the past, where advis-

able, it is my studied opinion that this proposed step is destructive rather than constructive.

"It should be remembered that many colleges and universities in America do not find it possible to operate under the selective admissions plan, and that as a result they must adapt their curricula and accompanying degree programs to an extremely varied degree of preparation and ability in the student bodies affected. The institution which has been outstanding in proposing the A.B. degree for two years' work is not so situated and, I might even say, handicapped.

"The A.B. degree has been the outstanding baccalaureate degree in its significance and indication of achievement. In my estimation, to lower its standing would be to undermine the purpose and plan of higher education in America."

Professor Knight points out certain special dangers in confusing standards at this time:

"Personally I think it dangerous to give the A.B. degree as a junior college degree. I think that the agitation for the reduction of the A.B. course to a two-year degree would be menacing to higher education in this country. I am in hearty agreement with the position of President W. H. Cowley as stated in the *Educational Record* for April, 1942.

"Undoubtedly failures and flaws in the educational work of this country are likely to appear in the present emergency, as was the case in the first world war. But to abandon sound educational practices, to revise sound educational curricula, and to offer collegiate degrees in a drastically reduced period seem to me to be very dangerous. Of course, one of the responsibilities of higher education now is to give fully and unselfishly all that it has and all that it is to the efforts of the war. This is not a sacrifice but a privilege. But higher education should also try to do better what it is expected to do and to be very vigilant in the maintenance of as creditable standards as the requirements of the efforts of war permit. The colleges and universities are not called on to cheapen their work. These institutions must guard carefully against any temptation to do so. Competition for students, which is a deadly affliction in fair weather days, must be prevented. Cheap higher educational programs and cheap academic degrees can make no vital contribution to winning the war or the peace or in providing that leadership which will be so necessary after the war. To protect good standards now will reduce the temptation to lower standards after the crisis has passed. In the long run nothing could be more unpatriotic or menacing than for our higher educational institutions to send out poorly educated teachers, physicians, lawyers, and engineers, and other workers. When peace returns there will be need as never before for the best brains, the highest intelligence, and the wisest leadership that can be provided. For these

resources we must depend upon the high quality of the work of the schools and colleges."

President McConnell well expresses the general views of most of the other contributors:

"There is no impropriety, as I see it, in conferring a degree upon one who has completed one, two, or three years of college work. I think there are good reasons for conferring a degree at the end of two years of work which has been brought to a definite close. I do not favor calling this degree the A.B. degree. I see no reason for conferring a degree which has traditionally stood for four years' work upon students who have completed two.

"I recognize the fact that now and then exceptionally capable men and women enter college who are able to complete the normal four years of work in a much shorter time. They should be permitted to do so, and the degree standing for four years' work should be conferred upon them.

"There was originally no very good reason for calling a certain unit of length an inch, but having called it that for many years, I can see no reason why a unit half as long should be called an inch."

Registrar Mathews agrees:

"I have no objection to a degree at the end of the sophomore year. In fact, there is much to be said in favor of such a degree and little of consequence against it. I see no reason, though, for changing the practice of awarding the A.A. degree at the end of the sophomore year and giving in place of it the A.B. degree. On the contrary there are a number of good reasons for not doing so. Among them are the following: (1) the Bachelor of Arts degree has been in use for about three hundred years in this country and it has acquired a fixed place in the thinking and understanding of the people; (2) the change proposed would cheapen this degree as now held by thousands of people and prove embarrassing to them; (3) the change would work chaos in the years to come for the public would not know whether an individual held an A.B. degree based on four years of work or only two; (4) junior colleges and senior colleges would both be awarding the A.B. degree and would seem to be in competition instead of in cooperation as at present."

President May writes:

"I doubt that the Junior College will attempt to give an A.B. or B.S. degree. Probably a degree in Associate of Arts or something of that nature would be better. On the other hand, there is good argument, which I think should be presented—that we are accelerating our educational program in the high schools, the junior colleges, and senior colleges, and if a degree could be secured by the time the student finishes junior college, he

would be in better position to make his contribution in the war effort. However, I think it will be necessary to overhaul the whole traditional Bachelor of Arts set-up, which probably needs to be done."

President Meadows comments:

"I am opposed to granting the A.B. degree for two years work. I do not believe it would be wise to give the A.B. at the close of two years in a senior college, or at the completion of the course in a junior college.

"I believe such a procedure would be most detrimental to higher education in America today."

President Montgomery writes:

"I do not favor giving the A.B. degree as a junior college degree. If this practice should be started, it would tend only to great confusion and ultimately to the destroying of the present baccalaureate degree of the four-year college. It would mean a revamping of the whole higher educational system of America and break down to the minimum the liberal arts program when it seems to me that greater stress should be placed upon it.

"The security of democracy depends more upon the increasing of the liberal arts than upon the decreasing of this emphasis. Men highly trained in special fields will become a menace to democracy unless their social attitudes and understandings are broadened in a way that would be commensurate to their specialization. This is to say that our big problem in the world, as I see it, is at the point of human relationships rather than at the point of more scientific knowledge and technical advancement.

"The four-year liberal arts college has always been concerned with developing by the educational process human life and human society and of creating in men a social sensitivity and responsiveness. If we fail at this point, there is no hope of peace or of the survival of democracy.

"I am very greatly concerned about this whole trend to whittle down our liberal arts program in education."

Mother Angelique states her thinking on the problem thus:

"I am following with interest the discussion regarding the attempt to make the A.B. course two years in length. Junior colleges in some places have been giving an A.A. degree for the completion of a two years course. I do not see the value in making a change in the name of the degree; it will not necessarily make the A.A. any stronger, and will make for confusion regarding the value of the current four-year A.B. I can see no objection to having a three-year course follow the A.A. and lead to an A.M. without the A.B. degree being conferred en route, just as students now may have a three-year course after the A.B. leading to a Ph.D. degree without taking an A.M.

"I think a great many things could be done to strengthen academically all the degrees, and I believe that this strengthening can be begun in the grammar grades. The present emergency, in spite of all that mathematicians and such folk may say to the contrary, is showing that the products of our schools have adaptability and what it takes to do quite well the job at hand. I should like to indict the departments of philosophy, economics, and sociology, that have produced the politicians and economists who have so mused up the world that they are demanding supermen, mathematicians and scientists, to demolish what they have constructed so that they may have a new start. There are some basic things besides the multiplication table that have been woefully neglected, and their resuscitation might go a long way towards supplying what may be missing in our educational scheme; but this can be done without changing the name of the A.A. degree.

"There is so much tampering being done now with courses and credits, and incidentally with students, that even necessary changes will be questioned when we return to normalcy. The student mind has to have time to mature. Much depends upon the habits of thought acquired during the formative years. What content is needed to carry on correct habit-forming thought is more of a question than what name the periods of formation should bear."

President Murfee bluntly says:

"I think this proposition is thoroughly absurd. It would discredit every A.B. degree that has heretofore been awarded by standard four-year colleges. It would cheapen higher education in America, since the junior college course of study is designed for immature young men and women who have not yet reached the ages of maturity necessary to comprehend the courses that should be included in the Bachelor of Arts course of study."

President Noffsinger agrees with his colleagues in the junior colleges in repudiating the A.B. degree at the end of two years:

"The writer is a junior college man of thirty years' observation and experience in the junior college field. The offering of the Bachelor's degree by a great university for two years' work is a body blow at the four-year liberal arts college, and of no value to the independent junior college. Few, if any, independent junior colleges will attempt to appropriate a degree that is peculiarly the property of the four-year liberal arts college.

"There is no valid objection to accelerating the program in any institution. But for results accomplished in 22 months to be labeled with the time-honored Bachelor's degree that has meant the equivalent of 36 months' work is to weaken the worth of every such degree that will be given and cast reflection on all that have been given.

"There should be no objection to using the Associate in Arts degree or title for the equivalent of two years' work above the high school level. If

anyone does object to this pretty well established usage, let him invent some designation suited to his own need, and not take a degree that is almost sacred to the four-year liberal arts college."

Dean Oppenheimer does not raise the last point urged by Dean Hewlett and thinks of the whole question as being one of experimentation:

"I would not commit myself on how long it would take to get an A.B. degree. I think President Hutchins has raised a very important issue for higher education. I think that the answer to his challenge must come through experimentation and research and not by a *priori* pronouncement.

"As I see it, liberal arts colleges should first try to answer the question of what is liberal education in terms of present-day individual and social needs, and second, how well are we accomplishing these ends.

"To answer these questions we may consider the findings of such cooperative studies as are undertaken by the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research of the Southern Association, the experimental work at the University of Florida and the University of Georgia, and other Southern institutions, also the Cooperative Study in General Education of the American Council on Education. All these appeal to me as being undertakings which will provide an answer to the challenge of whether to shorten the curriculum."

President Page says briefly:

"It seems to me that this would do a great injustice to the standards which we have set up for a Bachelor's degree in the past. While I do not think that it is necessary, if there are those who want a degree for junior college graduates, I have no criticism. It does seem, however, that some new degree could be created. Let us retain the A.B. degree as now is, and not cheapen the degree which thousands of people already have."

Dean Pinchbeck holds similar views:

"It is my considered opinion that the granting of the A.B. degree by a junior college would vitiate the meaning of the degree.

"I have always been in favor of as many students as could find it practicable to do so arranging to complete their A.B. degree requirements within three years. This, of course, would require attendance upon one or more summer sessions.

"I suppose it would be entirely possible to do all the academic work required for the A.B. degree in two years, if we wanted to put the college on a factory basis, of eight hours a day six days in the week, with no other activities than classroom recitations, laboratories and private study. If this procedure were undertaken, however, I believe the main purpose of a liberal

arts education would be as violated as it would be by the proposal to grant the A.B. degree on the basis of junior college work."

Dean Purks is somewhat caustic:

"The significance of the A.B. degree is being destroyed from above by the infiltration of useless professional courses. It is being undermined from below by the woefully inadequate preparation of the entering freshmen in English and in mathematics. It is now being hit in the middle by the silly proposal to award the degree for two years of so-called college work. The truth of the matter is that the only significance attached to the degree now is the good name of the institution which awards it.

"Colleges and secondary schools have gone down so fast in recent years that this proposal would result in the Bachelor's degree being awarded in over half of the cases to students who have less formal education than the graduate of the better high schools of a quarter of a century ago.

"If everyone wants an A.B. degree, let us pass a law which automatically confers the degree upon every child at the instant of birth. Perhaps then educators and public will begin to think in terms of education rather than in terms of degrees, enrollments, and diversity of course offerings."

President Sadler states his position more judicially, but agrees in tenor:

"I have read with a great deal of interest the statements and articles by President Hutchins of the University of Chicago and find myself in rather complete agreement with many of his position. However, it does seem to me that his proposal to grant the A.B. degree at the conclusion of junior college work is impractical, unwise, and unnecessary in carrying out his basic educational philosophy. I believe it is possible to do a sufficient amount of general education in fourteen years and a superior type of selective education beyond this point. But I believe appropriate and satisfactory recognition could be devised for this general education work at the same time that the A.B. and other older degrees could be retained for a more selective and more effective type of educational achievement."

Registrar Setzler thinks of a junior college degree desirable if labeled differently from the A.B.:

"I am definitely not in favor of giving the A.B. degree as a junior college degree. I am in sympathy with any movement which would tend to encourage masses of students to secure at least two years of general education at the college level. Probably some degree label could be attached to the certificate or diploma of those students finishing that amount of work. Certainly that label should not be the 'A.B.'.

"The term 'A.B.' for a long time has carried a specific meaning to the

minds of our people and any new designation of meaning for that term would result in hopeless and useless confusion."

Sister Charles Mary expresses her opinion briefly:

"I am much opposed to any plan whereby the A.B. degree will be granted upon the completion of only two years of college work."

Dean Austin Smith enumerates his objections:

"I am opposed to making the A.B. degree a junior college degree. Such a policy would:

"1. Definitely cheapen the present A.B. degree, now held by many, conferred on four years of college work, and would require an explanation of values and standards before and after the change;

"2. Emphasize far beyond its real significance the value of two years of college work while not adding one whit to its real worth;

"3. Have a tendency to cheapen the value of the A.M. and Ph.D. degrees and to decrease by two years the requirements for those degrees;

"4. Make it necessary to adopt some other designation for degrees conferred on four years of college work: nothing could be gained by such a switch of nomenclature, unless it has become definitely necessary to cheapen the A.B. degree.

"In theory, standards in elementary and high schools and in colleges have been raised, but in application (practice), some fear they have been lowered. Such a change would further lower present standards."

Dean ten Hoor desires to retain the present A.B. degree but is willing to offer a two-year degree also:

"I am definitely not in favor of giving an A.B. degree as a junior college degree. I think it would be rather a good idea to give *some sort* of degree at the end of the junior college period, as this is, for many students, the end of their formal education. In my opinion it would be much better to create a new degree than to confuse hopelessly the traditional significance of the present Bachelor's degree.

"In addition to creating hopeless confusion, the granting of a Bachelor's degree at the end of the junior college period would leave the liberal arts colleges in a very difficult position. The end of the four-year college is the termination of formal education for tens of thousands of students today. Why should they not be entitled to a degree also? Such a degree would either have to be a Master's degree, or some new degree. If a new degree is to be created, it would be better to create one for the junior college."

THE A.B. DEGREE FOR TWO YEARS' WORK: AN OPEN FORUM

President Thompson agrees with the other presidents of junior colleges:

"As president of a junior college I do not favor the granting of the degree at the end of two years of college work as a junior college degree. I think the practice now followed by many junior colleges of granting an Associate in Arts diploma at the end of the sophomore year is quite sufficient, for it seems to be satisfactory to the students and to the institutions. Nor is there any demand among the students attending this institution for the A.B. degree at the end of two years of college work. I presume the reason for this is that the A.B. degree has long been known as a liberal arts degree representing four years of solid work. The public generally also has such a concept. It would therefore seem to me to be inconsistent and quite out of place for educators themselves to cheapen this time-honored degree.

"We perhaps could understand an upsurge of feeling on the part of the uninitiated, especially by those who are looking for short-cuts and who are willing to cheapen things of highest value, that it would be desirable to secure the Bachelor of Arts degree by only two years of effort. One would think that any educator worthy of the name would resist such a tendency. It is my judgment that educators should resist such a tendency. And even though a junior college might stand to profit financially and in other ways from a practice of granting the Bachelor's degree at the end of two years of work, I could not support such an idea, for I believe that it is against the best interest of education generally, and hence in the long run against the best interest of junior colleges themselves."

Dean Ullrich summarizes fully:

"Traditionally, the Bachelor's degree requires eight semesters of a given quality and quantity of work beyond that of the high school level. To grant this well-recognized degree to students who master one-half as much content and who achieve a quality of work one-half as advanced is quite arbitrary and unwarranted. One might as well call a half-grown calf a cow.

"If the advocates of the A.B. degree for two years' work intend to require the same quantity and quality of work as heretofore but make it available in 104 consecutive calendar weeks by eliminating holidays and summer vacations, they have a partial case. Some exceptionally bright students have managed to do that under the present system. But the big question mark remains: can the brain of the average student respond to such an accelerated and concentrated program? Education is a growth, and the rate of acquiring an education has physiological limits. The time element in mastering such subjects as physics and mathematics cannot be ignored. One cannot fill a jug faster than the neck will permit.

"If the advocates of this new deal in education intend to congest the same content and achieve the same quality of work in one half of the net time now

required, they may also have a case. In this event, we have a measure of how badly we have done the job of higher education heretofore.

"The seat of the trouble, in my judgment, is the fact that the college curriculum has been diluted with respect to both quality and quantity. The remedy is in raising the standards of admission to college. This involves returning to the secondary schools those subjects which are of a secondary grade, such as freshman English and a reading knowledge of a foreign language.

"An alternative might be suggested. If the junior college is merged with the high school, and the standards of this combined school improved, the entire senior college might be abandoned. Students mastering the proper curriculum pattern might be admitted directly to professional schools, and those of an academic turn of mind might begin work toward a Ph.D. degree. The Master's degree could also be abandoned. Radical changes such as these would be largely administrative. In the final outcome, we shall have first rate scholars, master teachers, and brilliant research men regardless of the degree labels with which we seek to honor them."

President Vaughan is qualifiedly in favor of a general re-organization of higher education:

"This question leaves me in a state of confusion. Frankly, I think higher education is due a general reorganization. I am very frankly of the opinion that the four-year secondary education course, as it is now organized, and the four-year college course provide entirely too much overlapping.

"I am firmly of the opinion that the right sort of a program could provide a better education at the end of six years than our typical program does now at the end of eight years. Yet, I am not willing, at present, to reduce the four-year college course to two years.

"I do believe that the sensible attack on the problem is to reorganize the eight years of work given in the secondary school and in the college into a six-year program. We could eliminate overlapping and secure a great deal more work on the part of students and provide a richer program of study than we have at present.

"If the University of Chicago plan provides for this reorganization and for a higher quality of work on the part of college students, I am very much in favor of it. I think it certainly merits our careful consideration and analysis."

Dean Weathersby briefly states the bases of his opposition to the proposed plan:

"First, such a program would destroy a standard set up as a result of many years of effort, and result in educational confusion.

"Second, it would lower standards of general education at a time when we greatly need to raise them.

"Third, it would encourage specialization based upon an inadequate foundation."

Dean White comments:

"For many years the Bachelor's degree, whether A.B. or B.S., has at least stood for one definite fact. That fact is that the degree represents four years of college work above high school graduation. Many weak points have obtained in the degrees of some institutions; but the Bachelor's degree has at least stood for four years of college work.

"Therefore, I am opposed to the granting of the A.B. degree or the B.S. degree by junior colleges or by senior colleges if such work is based upon only two years of college credit. The adoption of such a policy would, in my opinion, lower the standard of higher education in America.

"It is true that many students are superior to other students in any college. But the superior students have at least two opportunities to shorten the time required for graduation: first, they are allowed, in most institutions, to carry extra work by reason of superior grades; second, they have the opportunity to attend summer school, and thus reduce the calendar time required for graduation."

President Whitley states his views with usual conciseness:

"I do not favor the granting of the A.B. degree for two years college work. I am not in favor of junior colleges or senior colleges conferring the degree for the following reasons:

"1. To do so will, in my opinion, cheapen the esteem which the educational world has always had for the A.B. degree.

"2. This is no time to lower the standards of training of people either for life or for national defense.

"3. In my opinion to confer this degree at the end of two years of college work will be to turn loose upon the public a lot of immature people who will claim all the rights and prerogatives of the A.B. degree.

"4. The movement to confer the A.B. degree at the end of two years of college work is in my opinion a bid for students to enter or to remain in college. I do not favor the adoption of such measures in order to induce young people to go to college or to remain in college after they enter."

Dean Wood says tersely:

"In my opinion, we are not ready to inaugurate such a program. I believe there will be a tendency for the public to get the idea that two years of college will satisfy the needs of the average person as well as four years,"

Professor Yeuell philosophizes:

"With the set-up and tradition in America as it is, I doubt the advisability of granting the A.B. degree on the completion of two years of college work. This, however, does not mean that everything is well. At present, neither the A.B. nor the B.S. degrees have any specific meaning so far as content is concerned. It seems to the writer that we shall have to continue to wrestle with the problem as to whether there is the thing we have called general education, and if so, what is its content? At the present time this problem is greatly muddled by the war situation which demands a type of vocational training which may or may not be education *per se*, and for that reason it is exceedingly difficult to approach the problem in an unbiased manner. Also it is doubtful at present what per cent of the general population can be benefitted by the type of thing we normally think of as general education.

"There are a good many of us who still cling to the pansophic idea, and who hope that the time will come when every American, who is capable of it, will be introduced in some manner or other to as much of the racial wisdom as possible on both the secondary and higher level. Perhaps this may be done as an aspect of vocational training. On the other hand, it may better be attempted before the vocational problem looms, or for that matter after the trade or profession has been mastered. At present, we simply do not know the answer.

"However, the writer is of the opinion that the post-war American will need a personal, national, and world philosophy of life which cannot be developed by narrow specialization, nor by the pure mastery of techniques as such. Without doubt the present world mess is partly the result of just that lack. Some way or other we must develop a great synthesis and understanding of the problems of modern life, and it is doubtful whether this can be achieved without calling on the wisdom of the past as well as experimentation in terms of the present. Philosophy can result only from broad, not narrow, understandings.

"Perhaps this may be achieved in two, four, or six years. Who knows? Certainly, experimentation toward that end should be encouraged and probably no higher institution of learning in America is more alive to the situation than the University of Chicago. It should be encouraged to go forward, and perhaps we need just the jolt it has given us. On the other hand, vested interests must be guarded, and it is probably unwise to push even a good cause too far and too fast.

"Can the average American achieve wisdom and understanding? Perhaps that is what the A.B. degree should stand for; if so, it is not a matter of years, but of many other factors. Let us continue to grapple with this problem in all seriousness and it will probably appear that years as such have no real meaning. Certainly, the authorities at Chicago realize this and take it

into consideration, but they may or may not have found the answer. Until it is certain that they have, it seems to the writer wise to undertake the solution within the traditional frame-work for practical rather than absolute reasons, and this is especially true as long as the philosophy of secondary education is as unsettled as it is at present. Until one philosophy dominates both the secondary and higher institution, it will probably take most higher institutions more than two years to grant a real A.B. degree in terms of the ideas expressed above. Certain private institutions can pick and choose their students. Most of us have to deal with things as they are, but we do not need to be content or satisfied. It seems to the writer that the whole problem of education in America needs to be rethought. Let us keep on rethinking."

Editorial Notes

Forty-seventh Annual Meeting
November 30-December 4, 1942, Peabody Hotel,
Memphis, Tennessee.

The Forty-seventh Annual Meeting of the Southern Association is scheduled for Memphis, Tennessee, November 30-December 4, 1942. The Peabody has been chosen as the headquarters hotel.

Executive Secretary M. C. Huntley makes the following announcement of the 1942 meeting of the Association.

The Forty-seventh Annual Meeting will be held in Memphis, Tennessee, beginning November 30 and ending December 4. All meetings will be held in the Peabody Hotel and all offices will be located there. The price for rooms at the Peabody will be as follows:

Single rooms, \$3.00 per day; if such rooms are desired as double rooms, the rate will be \$2.00 per person. In addition, the hotel will furnish 80 twin bed rooms at \$6.00 per day. The total number of rooms available at the Peabody is 400.

The following rates have been quoted by the Hotel Claridge:
Single rooms, \$2.50 to \$5.00 per day. Double rooms, \$4.00 to \$6.00 per day. Rooms with twin beds, \$5.00 to \$7.50 per day. There are 200 rooms available in this hotel.

The Hotel Chisca will have 125 rooms available at:
\$2.00 and \$2.50 per day, single, and \$3.00 to \$3.50 per day, double.

The Gayosa Hotel will have 125 rooms at \$2.00 to \$2.50, single; \$3.00 to \$3.50 per day, double.

Other hotels providing rooms at reasonable rates are the William Len and the Hotel DeVoy.

President M. E. Ligon writes that he hopes to release the program for the annual meeting some time early in September.

Making the A.B. Degree a Junior College Degree* (*Continued*)

The QUARTERLY is glad to present to its readers in this issue a full discussion of the proposal to make the A.B. a junior college degree. It regrets the inability of two long-standing friends of the Association, Dean Herbert E. Hawkes of Columbia University, and Professor Emit Duncan Grizzell

*For a full discussion of junior college degrees, see *Associate's Degree and Graduation Practices in Junior Colleges*, Terminal Education Monograph No. 4, by W. C. Eells, just issued by the American Association of Junior Colleges.—EDITOR.

of the University of Pennsylvania, to contribute their views. They were prevented by the pressure of time and the many activities crowding upon them at this time. The *QUARTERLY* regrets also that President Hutchins of Chicago and President Cowley of Hamilton were unable to contribute. President Hutchins courteously considered the matter, but finally had to refer to Dean Faust's article as probably sufficient to represent the official Chicago point of view. President Cowley received our request too late to be able to meet the deadline. However, we believe that the presentation of the problem in this issue of the *QUARTERLY* is as full as has appeared.

Since practically all articles favorable to the proposal have come either from the University of Chicago or from alumni of its graduate schools, it is probably to be expected that direct references of praise or blame for that university or its president now and then appear in the discussion. Fortunately, these have been reasonably restrained.

It will be remembered that Chicago still has alumni who were graduate students within the first few years of President Harper's administration. They have carried through the years and handed down to some of their successors a loyalty rare among the alumni of graduate schools in this country. They respond with an almost undergraduate loyalty to appeals to the Chicago tradition. But to other equally loyal alumni and friends of the University it is somewhat sobering to realize that in all this discussion of the past six months President Hutchins and a few Chicago alumni stand almost isolated in approving his single-handed attempt to re-define the A.B. degree while at the same time admitting that its prestige is such that he cannot achieve a reorganization of liberal education to fit his definition without appropriating the degree.

This fact may indicate that the interest aroused by the proposal will quickly simmer down to a realization that the desire of one institution to re-define a term like the A.B. degree is after all a local decision of greater or less interest but not a world-shaking event.

Disciplining (!) the University of Chicago

When the excited friends of the Chicago plan speak of the University being "disciplined" through the possible refusal of other institutions to accept credits given, they are overlooking the ability of American educators to see through definitions. Stripped of all its controversial glamour, *the Chicago proposal seems to boil down to this: a degree at the end of what is now the sophomore year of college which Chicago has elected to call the A.B., followed by a three-year course leading to the A.M. degree and professional degrees to be based upon the two-year A.B., with the Ph.D. degree presumably following in due course after the A.M. work has been completed (with or without the actual award of the A.M.).* If therefore a student from Chicago or any other institution

following this plan transfers at the end of his freshman year to an institution following the presently accepted definitions, he simply obtains credit for the first year of the four-year A.B. course. If the student elects to transfer at the end of two years, his two-year A.B. would still be accepted as indicating two years of work toward the four-year A.B., which he could complete in two years as would a transfer student from any other two-year course. At the end of a third year he would complete his A.M., at precisely the same point he would complete his A.M. at Chicago. There is no question whatever of "discipline" involved.

The Two-Year A.B. and the Associations of Colleges

This excited talk of discipline, however, indicates a fundamental misunderstanding of the function and value of the associations of colleges and secondary schools and the other so-called "accrediting" associations. These associations represent the ability of democratic institutions to evolve a form of customary law to supplant the practical anarchy that exists when every man undertakes to do that which is right in his own eyes. The associations grew up to provide agreements as to elementary definitions, or "standards," that would enable the public and would-be founders of schools and colleges to have a rough appraisal of what standards should be. Standards were necessarily formal and quantitative (although they have become increasingly qualitative.) They necessarily dealt with elementary things, and yet state legislatures, denominational leaders seeking to found new colleges, and men of wealth ambitious to endow schools gratefully accepted these elementary definitions and to a surprising degree met them. This fact is emphasized by the rarity of such exhibitions as the trouble in Georgia the last two years. The achievement of educational solidarity as to elementary definitions has in part been due to the willingness of the stronger colleges and universities to participate in the councils of their weaker brethren and abide by the decisions democratically arrived at. The proposal of the University of Chicago to make its own definitions without regard to the wishes and ideas of other institutions may, as some writers have indicated, be a serious blow at this voluntary cooperation among American colleges in building up standards. Superficially, it might appear so. Frankly, however, this editor believes that even now the action of Chicago has become simply an easily defined variation in definition of terms, perhaps already absorbed by American higher education in its stride. The traditions of the University are such that, however it may define terms, it will probably try to define them clearly and will maintain understandable standards in living up to its new definitions.

The example, of course, might be followed by many other institutions until there was no longer an accepted definition for any of the ordinarily

accepted educational terms. In fact, it is conceivable that state legislatures might follow the Chicago example and plunge into the business of defining and declare that state universities must award A.B. degrees at the end of *one* year to all students who have been in residence. We do not think this will happen: we simply point out that any university, or its president, shares with the humblest citizen as well as the legislature of a sovereign state the right to define old terms to express new ideas. To brand the exercise of this right of free speech as "courageous" or "arrogant," "far-sighted" or "near-sighted," "brave" or "ill-considered," may satisfy those desiring emotional expression but seems a bit over-emphatic for the occasion.

Comparing Acceleration Plans with the Two-Year Degree

It seems quite beside the point, moreover, to argue that the Chicago plan has in any degree the same origin as the acceleration plans of other universities. This argument ignores President Hutchins' claim that he is trying fundamentally to reorganize the Bachelor's degree and his theory that he is eliminating what he regards as non-liberal elements incorporated in that degree as administered under the four-year program. He does not claim to be enabling students to use their summers to accelerate their completion of the traditional course. He is frankly cutting the last two years of the four-year degree off, in order to add them to the Master's and professional degree. He emphatically states that it is a permanent and not a temporary expedient he is attempting.

The acceleration programs, on the other hand, are based on the theory of the four-year degree—the theory that the four-year degree represents work for which the normal student requires four years to complete, accompanied by four years of growing up while he is utilizing his summers socially and vocationally and is participating in various types of student activity. If a student whose work is superior in quality is able to carry a slight excess of course load during the academic term and wishes to utilize his summers to obtain a more rapid growth, as measured by the great majority who take the normal load and the full summer vacation, he has long been allowed the privilege of doing so; but he is still meeting the requirements of the four-year program and at every point is judged by the standards set for that program. To claim that the advocates of the four-year degree cannot recognize individual differences in permitting these types of acceleration is sharp rather than sound debating. Furthermore, as we have pointed out before, it would seem logical during this terrible time in the world's history to assume that a much larger number of students than is usually the case mature rapidly enough to be permitted opportunity for acceleration. Since the gradual maturing of the student looms

large in the thinking of the advocates of the four-year course for the degree, they are entirely logical in admitting a much more rapid maturing in the present state of the world. Finally, it is fair to point out that when the privilege of acceleration is extended to a large number of students, the advocates of the four-year degree frankly take the position that this acceleration is temporary and not permanent. In other words, the acceleration programs, good or bad, have nothing in common with the Chicago plan when we assume the sincerity of President Hutchins in stating that he wishes to *re-locate the Bachelor's degree* as part of what he regards a *fundamental change in the organization* of American higher education.

Further Comments Upon the Forum as to the Two-Year A.B.

The replies of administrators and faculty members of Southern institutions to the questions suggested on page 336 of the May *QUARTERLY* canvassed in varying degree the main arguments made by the friends and opponents of the two-year degree sufficiently to speak for themselves. The specific questions asked were not discussed with anything like equal interest and thoroughness. Brief comments on the questions indicating the editor's reactions will be given here. On account of brevity the reactions probably will read more dogmatically than they are intended to be stated.

1. *What will be the probable effects of the proposed change if only one or two universities adopt it?* It would seem from the discussion and from the logic of the situation that if the A.B. degree is given on the basis of two years of college work by only one or two institutions, the degree will continue to be regarded as a four-year degree and the new degree will simply be called the "Chicago A.B." or the "junior college A.B." It might well be that in the course of a few years there would seem no more inconsistency in speaking of an A.B. and a junior college A.B. than there now is in using the terms junior high school and high school (or senior high school).

2. *What will be the effect if a number of reasonably strong institutions adopt it?* If a number of reasonably strong institutions adopt the junior college A.B., there will naturally be somewhat more confusion than if one or two adopt it. On the other hand, similar differentiation of terms will probably take care of the situation. Thorough discussion has already clarified the initial confusion. As was pointed out, however, in the May *QUARTERLY*, any widespread adoption of the Chicago degree and its underlying theory will probably have serious consequences for many of the small colleges. The primary effect of adopting the Chicago plan will probably be to encourage the development of local junior colleges as a part of the public school system. Once these colleges accept comfortably a role of distributors of A.B. degrees—two-year or what not—the graduates will go to universities or colleges with outstanding prestige for their second (or four-year) A.B. Many good col-

leges that do not happen to possess the glamour of big names would simply disappear from the picture. They could not even reduce themselves to the status of a junior college, for the good reason that they would be competing with tax-supported institutions located in the home communities of the students.

3. *Has the four-year college outlived its place in American education?* There seems to be general agreement, although not unanimous, that the four-year college has not outlived its place in American education. The fact that the advocates of the Chicago plan, when they express it in detail, wish to take two years from the present senior high school in order to make a four-year unit of the new "Baccalaureate" institution, in itself shows the hold the four-year college has. The new four-year colleges, as we pointed out, would probably be local, tax-supported institutions, without dormitories and without the college life we now regard as desirable. How far the universities and better established colleges could continue on their present basis rather than becoming more like the European universities in emphasizing professional studies and purely intellectual attainments is problematical. The advocates of the Chicago plan apparently prefer that this result should follow.

4. *Should the typical American four-year college, with its extracurricular activities and provisions for residence on the campus, be abandoned in favor of a system of predominantly local junior colleges, supplemented by a system of advanced professional and graduate schools with little or no campus life; that is, with as nearly as possible a complete emphasis upon professional and intellectual attainment?* This question, restating at greater length number three preceding, is fundamental in certain aspects of the main problem, but it receives little direct attention. It probably merits thoughtful discussion. Of course the municipal universities already represent a step in the direction of higher institutions relatively freed from extracurricular activities.

5. *Should there be a degree granted wholly on the basis of examination by universities to persons who pass stated examinations?* (It will be recalled that it has not been long since most of the English universities other than Oxford and Cambridge followed this practice.) 6. *Should there be a degree awarded primarily upon the basis of examinations?*

These questions have received very little discussion. It is probable that the attempt to base a degree in any large part upon examinations is recognized by its advocates as being so debatable that they are not at present prepared to emphasize this point. Comprehensive examinations just at present seem to be much more satisfactory in theory than in practice. The time-honored doctoral examination is itself subject to much criticism. If the Chicago plan is a break with tradition in attempting to give the A.B. degree two years earlier than it is now given, it is certainly no break with tradition

in its emphasis upon examinations. Granting of degrees primarily upon the basis of examinations is an old educational practice. There is nothing new in the confidence of examiners that they can ask questions to test information, growth, or whatever they profess to be testing. If this theory is logical, it would seem a fair subject of inquiry to develop degrees to be awarded without any residence requirement whatever and based solely upon examinations.

7. *Are two years of college work sufficient for the general student who does not expect to enter a profession?* Obviously this question cannot be answered with any assurance unless the person who attempts to answer it canvasses pretty thoroughly his underlying philosophy. The answers to this question suggested in the forum in this issue of the *QUARTERLY* and in the articles contributed indicate that any answer is meaningless unless we have a pretty clear understanding of the philosophy of education the person attempting the answer holds. The desire of those advocating the Chicago plan to reach down two years into the high school indicates a feeling that more than two years of integrated work is desirable. It might also be pointed out that the students who remain in a four-year college only one or two years are nevertheless living in "a four-year environment" while they attend college: those who believe that college life is worthwhile may contend that voluntary withdrawal of these students does not at all mean that they failed to obtain certain values from the fact of their temporary participation in the life of the four-year institution.

8. *Is it desirable for students to enter graduate and professional schools younger than they now do?* 9. *Should we reduce the period of elementary-secondary education to ten years, then add a four-year college, and then place professional and graduate schools on top of that, instead of having a twelve-year elementary-secondary school, etc.?*

These questions in a way re-state the problem that arises over and over again in this discussion. If the Chicago plan were to become general, it would of course turn out that general adoption would tend to wipe out most of the distinguishing features that President Hutchins has mentioned. It might well be that all that was left in another generation would be that students would graduate from college two years younger than they now do, with the same or a greater variety of courses in the four-year college, with just as many theories of general education and pre-professional education as at present.

Both of these questions are exceedingly complicated not only by theories of maturity but also by considerations as to how much general education the professional man should have before entering finally upon his specialization, and perhaps still more by a consideration of the integrating place higher education has in our civilization. We commend a reading of the material in this issue to ferret out suggestions in regard to the first two considerations—maturity of students and aim of general education—and address ourselves

briefly to the last consideration, which may be more important than most of the writers on the problem have indicated. It is readily conceded we have had a period of rapid increase in specialization. This specialization has increased the demands for specialized education of ever-increasing length and intensity. The most commonly accepted example is medicine—in which we have ordinarily demanded a four-year course, based upon an intensive pre-medical course of preferably four years, followed by one year of internship now grown into two years, with three or four years more of specialized professional training desirable. Obviously if the physician-specialist is to enter his profession at any reasonable age, either his specialized training must be reduced or his general education must be curtailed. Other professions are rapidly showing the same trend in demanding a training course in which the need for general education conflicts with the need for specialized professional education. Already in the case of medicine powerful voices have been raised by leaders of the profession to demand that not all curtailment be made at the expense of general education. These leaders insist that a physician needs a knowledge of literature and economics and government and problems of civilization generally as well as chemistry and zoology and professional courses. Already leaders of the profession are realizing that the medical specialist has to a degree cut himself off from a sympathetic understanding by his fellow citizens and perhaps a sympathetic understanding of contemporary civilization. After all, the binding of youth together in sympathetic participation in common activities centering around the study of human civilization, including the broad curriculum of the four-year college, is a contribution to civic solidarity and to sympathetic living together as fellow citizens that is overlooked entirely in the arguments of those who would have no students enter the four-year college except those almost certain to graduate and to go on to advanced professional work. The function of the four-year college in making for homogeneity of ideas among men of many trends and professions is not to be taken lightly. It is not at all clear that the much condemned “pre-” courses—pre-medical, pre-legal, pre-whatever else the reader may wish to condemn—are not quite properly taken in this atmosphere of broad common interests with other human beings at approximately the same stage of development. It is probably good for the soul of the embryo physician while he is getting his first inoculation of professional enthusiasm and specialization to have a roommate who is congenial in every way except that he loathes the odor of formaldehyde and alcohol and anything else connected with the laboratory and looks forward to being a judge or journalist or businessman. It is probably good also for the successful student to have close friends who do not succeed so well but whom he can recognize as worthwhile human beings nevertheless. And it is equally worthwhile for the unsuccessful to realize the human qualities of their more successful fellow students. This bringing together of boys of

varying interests and varied ability increases the difficulty of college deans and presidents and faculties; but if presidents and deans and faculties try to solve the problems posed, they probably make a greater contribution to American civilization than if they definitely strove to stratify American society on the basis of the I.Q. and extreme specialization.

10. Could the secondary schools meet some of the criticisms as to the waste involved in the present four-year college by making provision to accelerate the work of capable students? In other words, may not the proposal of a two-year A.B. degree come in part from the casual observing of bright students, intellectually mature, who have been held back in classes with pupils of the same chronological age?

This question indicates in its form, as far as this editor is concerned, a fundamental weak spot in American education. Educational psychology has had its flowering in the United States. American psychologists have learned more about individual differences than any group of psychologists elsewhere. In continental Europe and even in England, where society is more or less stratified and the aim is to fit every child for his station in life (without raising the embarrassing problem that the heir to the throne may have an I.Q. of 85 or 90 while the butler's son pushes 160), it is not surprising that no provision should be made in the schools for individual differences. (It should be recalled, however, that the French have very definitely for more than one hundred years tried to take care of their brighter minds by a system of competitive scholarships: both Napoleon and Marshal Foch were scholarship students.)

Instead of following a sane idea of democracy that would permit every child to develop according to his maturity and capacity, our school men have too often been afraid to use their knowledge of individual differences. A child may be oversize for his age both in height and weight and have other evidences of greater maturity than his chronological age would indicate. He may persistently play in school and out of school play with children one, two, or three years older than himself and give other evidences of social maturity. His I.Q. may be 140 or 150. But in spite of all this evidence that chronological age is the wrong criterion for grading him, the superintendents of schools talk blandly of "enriching the curriculum" and keep him with a group of the same chronological age, with the result that he has no opportunity to learn how to work: he learns instead how to coast along without effort and as a result is ruined for really good work in college or professional school. Even parents have been encouraged to believe that the child may become socially maladjusted if he is placed in his social, intellectual, and general-maturity group instead of being held back with those of the same chronological age. The injustice done to these students who have greater capacity and fundamental maturity has furnished much of the ammunition used by those who wish to lower the placement of the A.B. degree. It may well be, however, that an elementary-secondary school of ten years that

ignores problems of individual differences will prove just as disappointing as a similar lock-step system that lasts twelve years. The fundamental lack of democracy in the lock-step appears most clearly in the case of bright children who come from poor economic surroundings and have to go to work as soon as the child labor laws will permit. Many of these children if allowed to capitalize their ability would be two years farther along at the time they had to drop out of school, with the possibility of going much farther by reason of being far enough along to obtain financial assistance. This question of how to recognize individual differences, from kindergarten up, will probably be occupying the best minds of educators long after the Chicago plan has been forgotten.

11. *Is it desirable to keep the advanced work of college or university wholly for students of primarily intellectual interests?* My answer would be somewhat dogmatically "No." I am assuming that students of primarily intellectual interests have potential social use and are not to be mere esthetes isolated in their ivory towers. The problem of the man who is genuinely superior intellectually rather than merely so in his own estimation is to express himself in terms that can be understood by his less able fellows and also to understand his fellows and their needs. If he is to make a contribution, it is important that he solve this two-fold problem. The four-year undergraduate college as we have it today offers probably our best forum of understanding between those of primarily intellectual interests and those of broader interests. If this understanding is not achieved, the tragedy is at least as great for the intellectuals as for their fellows.

12. *Has the South made a mistake—in view of the present suggestions as to counting the last two years of high school as the first two of college—in accelerating the development from an eleven-year system of elementary and secondary education to a twelve-year system?*

Undoubtedly, if the Chicago idea should spread generally, the South will have to retrace its steps, along with other sections of the country. It is also probably true that during the present emergency it is a blunder to postpone the completion of the high school work by inserting an extra year between elementary and secondary education or by deliberately adding a fifth year of high school for those who have already completed a four-year high school course. The records completed by Doctor Joseph Roemer when he was Secretary of the Secondary Commission showed consistently very little difference in the preparation for college of students who graduated from eleven-year systems compared with those who graduated from twelve-year systems. Sometimes the difference, always slight, was in favor of those graduating from eleven-year systems. The demand in the South to change from the eleven-year system to the twelve-year system general in other parts of the country was very heavily emphasized by men from other sections of the country who came into the South to do educational work and with mis-

sionary zeal wished to lead their adopted section into "sweetness and light" by introducing what they could of the sections they had left behind. They were not willing to study carefully any advantages that the system they found might possess as compared with the system under which they had grown up. The demand was swelled by Southern school men who found it easier with the help of these men who had come in from elsewhere—either permanently or as "experts"—to obtain a twelfth grade than a ninth month of school. No studies were made of such problems, for instance, as of the possibility that children may mature more rapidly in southern climates or that perhaps the historical development of the twelfth grade system in New England and other sections of the country might not have been the best evolution. For instance, when the four-year high school about the time of Horace Mann was dumped bodily on top of the old common school, there was no particular reason why the common schools should be exactly eight years in length, as the advocates of the junior high school have persistently pointed out in the last twenty-five years. In fact some schools in Massachusetts—notably Brookline—within the last twenty years retained an elementary school of nine grades instead of eight. Furthermore, the twelve-grade system developed at a time when school terms were shorter than now and in the industrial sections of the country, which set the pace for educational organization outside of the South. The great force of the labor unions was in favor of keeping the child in school as long as possible, in order to keep him out of competition for jobs and reduce "technological unemployment." The South by sheer imitation scrapped its eleven-year system for a twelve-year system that had evolved elsewhere. If we make reasonable provision to meet individual differences, we may not have to reverse ourselves; otherwise, it is quite possible we shall have to do so.

New Presidents of Colleges

Dr. Edward N. Jones, a contributor to this issue of the *QUARTERLY*, who has been dean of Baylor University since 1934 and chairman of the department of Botany (and Biology) since 1925, has accepted the presidency of Texas College of Arts and Industries. President Jones has been a member of the Commission on Secondary Schools of the Southern Association since 1936.

Dr. Charles A. Anderson, president of Tusculum since 1931, has resigned to accept the presidency of Coe College in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. His successor as president of Tusculum is Dr. John McSween who was president of the Presbyterian College, Clinton, S. C. from 1908 to 1935. We are glad to welcome him back to the Association.

Sixty-fifth Consecutive Year

Dr. Landon Carter Haynes, dean emeritus and McCormick Professor of Mathematics and Physics at Tusculum was officially honored at the close of Tusculum's one hundred forty-seventh academic year on the successful completion of his sixty-fifth consecutive year of teaching at Tusculum. He is now 85 years old and is Tusculum's oldest living alumnus, a member of the class of 1877. He has been a member of the college faculty ever since that date.

Discussion Requested

Executive Secretary M. C. Huntley of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education suggests that we invite all institutions who wish to discuss the matter to contribute to a brief forum in the November *QUARTERLY* on problems caused by the loss of faculty members to the armed services and to other governmental activities. Of course these men when drafted into military service are given leaves of absence. What policy should be pursued toward men who for higher salaries or other reasons voluntarily accept positions outside of the institutions during the war? Can any policy be generally agreed upon? Contributions on this topic will be welcomed. They should reach the editorial office before October 1.

Another College History

The trustees of Roanoke College have published this summer an interesting volume of more than five hundred pages, entitled *The First Hundred Years, an Authentic History of Roanoke College, 1842-1942*, by William Edward Eisenberg. It is a service to Southern education to make these records of schools and colleges available to educational historians.

Theme for Memphis Meeting of the Commission on Secondary Schools

Father J. B. Bassich, the chairman of the Commission on Secondary Schools, announces the central theme for the Memphis meeting as "The War and the Secondary Schools of the South." He will appreciate suggestions from members of the Commission and others. The *QUARTERLY* repeats its request that any superintendents, principals, and faculty members of Southern Association schools who wish to do so contribute articles to the forum on this topic carried forward from the August issue.

